

ENGLISH STUDIES

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY

Edited

in collaboration with EILERT EKWALL,
Lund, and H. LÜDEKE, Basel,

by

R. W. ZANDVOORT
GRONINGEN

1941

VOLUME TWENTY-THREE

===== NOS 1-6 =====

N.V. SWETS & ZEITLINGER - Keizersgracht 471 - AMSTERDAM
VERLAG A. FRANCKE AG., BERN
EINAR MUNKSGAARD, COPENHAGEN

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

	Page
BRAAKSMA, M. H.,	Has Modern English a Genitive Plural? 65
EKWALL, E.,	Lexicographical and Etymological Notes 97
HARTSTRA, W. G.,	Some Puritan Elements in Browning's Poetry 33
KIRCHNER, G.,	The Road to Standard English 143 ¹
KRANENDONK, A. G. v.,	Cranford 171
LÜDEKE, H.,	Zola and the American Public 129, 161
SWART, J.,	Lyly and Pettie 9
ZANDVOORT, R. W.,	<i>Elckerlijc — Everyman</i> 1 ²

REVIEWS

Allen, B. Sprague,	Tides in English Taste (H. LÜDEKE)	115
Blasche, H.,	Angelsachsen und Kelten (A. G. VAN HAMEL)	153
Ten Bruggencate- Broers,	Engels Woordenboek, 13th ed. (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	61
Buchmann, R.,	Martin Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind (C. A. BODELSEN)	157
Cazamian, L. (ed.),	Collection Bilingue des Classiques Anglais (G. H. GOETHART)	119
Cazamian, M. L.,	Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre (1880-1900) (H. LÜDEKE)	184
Christy, A.,	The Orient in American Transcendentalism (H. LÜDEKE)	58

¹ See also 179.

² See also 41.

		Page
Draper, J. W.,	The <i>Hamlet</i> of Shakespeare's Audience (H. DE GROOT)	89
Egle, A.,	Milton und Italien (M. PRAZ)	181
Gramm, W.,	Die Körperpflege der Angelsachsen (B. J. TIMMER)	88
Groom, W.,	The Formation and Use of Compound Epithets in English Poetry from 1579 (A. H. BRAND)	25
Guidi, A.,	John Milton (M. PRAZ)	181
Harvey Wood, H. (ed.),	The Plays of John Marston (M. PRAZ)	55
Hitchcock, E. V. (ed.),	Roper's Life of More (W. A. G. DOYLE-DAVIDSON)	52
Jespersen, O.,	A Modern English Grammar, V (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	448
Kruisinga, E.,	An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds, 7th ed. (M. SCHUBIGER)	124
Littmann, H.,	Die Metapher in Merediths und Hardys Lyrik (C. E. BAEHRENS)	122
Möllmer, H.,	Konjunktionen und Modus im Temporalsatz des Altenglischen (B. J. TIMMER)	154
Nethercot, A. H.,	Sir William D'avenant (W. A. OVAA)	27
Parrott, Th. M. & Craig, H. (edd.),	The Tragedy of Hamlet (H. DE GROOT)	112
Ross, Sir E. D.,	This English Language (P. J. H. O. SCHUT)	91
Routh, E. M. G.,	Sir Thomas More and his Friends (W. A. G. DOYLE-DAVIDSON)	52
Schultz, F.,	Der Deutsche in der englischen Literatur (C. A. BODELSEN)	29
Silberschmidt, M.,	Der Aufstieg der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika zur Weltmacht (H. LÜDEKE)	188
Thompson, C. R.,	The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More (R. STAMM)	180
Tillyard, E. M. W.,	The Miltonic Setting Past and Present (M. PRAZ)	181

³ See also 80.

	Page
Tillyard, P. B. (tr.),	Milton, Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises (M. PRAZ) 181
Umpfenbach, H.,	Die oa-Schreibung im Englischen (M. SCHUBIGER) 190
Woolf, H. B.,	The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving (E. EKWALL) 83
Wright, C. E.,	The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England (K. MALONE) 110

MISCELLANEOUS

Notes and News

Anderson, O. S., Eilert Ekwall, 1877-1942, 177. — Gerritsen, J., Lord Byron's Name, 22. — Häusermann, H. W., *East Coker* by T. S. Eliot, 108. — Jespersen, O., A Rejoinder, 80. — King, A. H., A Note on the Virgil Translation in *Poetaster* v. ii., 75. — Lüdeke, H., Bulwer-Lytton on Art: a Measure of Victorian Taste, 106. — Palfrey, Th. R., Lady Byron and Louise Swanton Belloc's *Lord Byron*, 19. — Zandvoort, R. W., *Elckerlijc* — *Everyman*, 41. — Z., The Conclusive Perfect, 179.

War Words: Further Comments, 24. — Granville-Barker on Phonetic Alphabet, 24. — J. Koolstra †, 25.

Brief Mention	31, 62, 92, 158, 191
Bibliography	31, 62, 94, 125, 160

Elckerlijc - Everyman

Ever since G. Kalff, in 1890, mooted the question of the relation between the Dutch morality *Elckerlijc* and its English counterpart *Everyman*¹ Dutch and Flemish scholars have occupied themselves with the various problems raised by the study of these most famous of medieval religious plays. The materials for a comparison between the two versions were provided in a convenient form by H. Logeman in a parallel-text edition (1892)², in the introduction to which he agreed with Kalff in believing the English play to be a close rendering of the Dutch. The opposite view was maintained by K. H. de Raaf in a critical edition of *Elckerlijc* in 1897³, which called forth a detailed reply by Logeman in 1902⁴. In 1904 J. W. van Bart, in his edition of *Een Comedia ofte Spel van Homulus*⁵ (a play derived from *Elckerlijc*) thought it "not improbable" that both *Elckerlijc* and *Everyman* were translated from a common (Latin?) original, a supposition which for lack of evidence must remain a conjecture. After an interval of nearly thirty years L. Willems took up the matter in his *Elckerlijc-Studiën*⁶, in which he advanced further arguments in support of the priority of *Elckerlijc*, proposed a number of emendations of the text of the Dutch play, and printed a late sixteenth-century manuscript copy of *Elckerlijc* that had recently come to light. Further emendations were proposed by J. W. Muller in 1935⁷; in the meantime a useful annotated edition of *Elckerlijc*, with a good introduction, had been published by H. J. E. Endepols⁸. In 1940 G. Kazemier⁹ pointed out remarkable affinities between *Elckerlijc* and Colijn Caillieu's *Dal sonder Wederkeeren of Pas der Doot*, a translation of *Le Pas de la Mort* by Amé de Montgesoie, on the one hand, and the works of Ruusbroec, notably his *Spieghel der eeuwigher salicheit*, on the other. This close affinity between *Elckerlijc*

¹ *Tijdschrift voor Ned. Taal en Lett.*, IX, 12-20. A fuller discussion by the same writer is to be found in his review of Logeman's edition in *Taal en Letteren*, IV (1894), 112-125.

² *Elckerlijc and Everyman*, ed. by H. Logeman. Ghent.

³ *Den Spyghel der Salicheyt van Elckerlijc*, critisch uitgegeven en van een inleiding en aantekeningen voorzien. Groningen diss.

⁴ *Elckerlijc-Everyman*. De vraag naar de prioriteit opnieuw onderzocht. Ghent.

⁵ Utrecht diss. The possibility of a common original had also been considered by earlier writers on the subject.

⁶ The Hague, 1934. Previously published in the *Verslagen der Vlaamsche Academie*, 1932, 1933. In his first chapter Willems shows that Logeman's identification of Petrus Diesthemius (= Peter of Diest), the author of *Elckerlijc*, with one Petrus Dorlandus, a Carthusian monk, rests on insufficient grounds.

⁷ Over *Elckerlijc*. Textcritische en exegetische aantekeningen. *Verslagen der Vlaamsche Academie*, 283-345.

⁸ Groningen, 1925; 3rd ed. 1932.

⁹ *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, 34, 87-96, 116-128.

and two works of Dutch soil increases the probability of the Dutch play being the original of *Everyman* rather than the other way about.¹⁰

Though it is, perhaps, natural that the problem of *Elckerlijc-Everyman* should have attracted Dutch rather than English students, some of the most cogent arguments for the priority of *Elckerlijc* have been brought forward by two American scholars, J. M. Manly and F. A. Wood, in two articles published jointly in *Modern Philology* in 1910¹¹. It is especially after reading their observations that one realizes how weak a case De Raaf was pleading when maintaining the priority of *Everyman*. Wood's concluding paragraph sums up the matter unequivocally:

In conclusion it may be said that, though *Ev.* in one or two instances may have improved on the original, *El.*, as a whole, is artistically superior. With the exception of a very few passages where the text is evidently corrupt, *El.* is written in fairly good language and meter. It is theologically correct and remarkably consistent and logical. It must have been the product of a trained mind. On the other hand *Ev.* is faulty in language and meter, wrong in theology, inapt in its biblical allusions, full of inconsistencies, and betrays on every page the hand of an unskilled workman who was not even capable of making a good translation. (p. 302.)

Wood's final remark may seem unduly harsh¹²; even in the twentieth century few Englishmen would be "capable of making a good translation" of a Dutch play in verse. Still it is true that a line-by-line and speech-by-speech comparison impresses one with the superiority, generally speaking, of the text of *Elckerlijc* to that of *Everyman*. Such a comparison has been made so often and so thoroughly that any one offering to repeat it is apt to lay himself open to the charge of flogging a dead horse. If, nevertheless, we venture to draw attention to a number of what seem to us important points it is partly because some of them appear to have escaped the notice of earlier investigators, and partly because, in this country at least, students of English have so far concerned themselves less with the subject than students of Dutch. Perhaps even some of those who know *Everyman*

¹⁰ Those interested in the famous crux *El.* 749 *roeyken* — *Ev.* 778 *rodde* may be referred, among others, to an article by Father Maximilianus in *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren*, XIV (1926), 1-6, and to a reply by Sister Hildegard van de Wijnpersse in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, XX (1926), 258-9. Creizenach's enthusiasm for this place as proving *Ev.* > *El.* (*CHEL* V, 53 n.), based on De Raaf's view, should, with all due deference, be treated with scepticism.

¹¹ In Germany textual notes on *Everyman* have been published by F. Holthausen in Herrig's *Archiv* 92 (1894), 411-2, and *Anglia Beiblatt* 32 (1921), 213-215; by E. Kölbing in *Englische Studien* 21 (1895), 170-2; by W. Bang *ib.* 35 (1905), 118-9. K. Goedeke, who did not know *Elckerlijc*, traced the provenance of the story of the dying man forsaken by his friends in his *Every-Man, Homulus und Hekastus* (1865), where he also printed the text of *Everyman* with a German translation opposite. — J. Bolte, in his edition of *Drei Schauspiele vom Sterbenden Menschen* (1927), p. x, still adheres to the view that *El.* is a translation of *Ev.*

¹² Like Brandl's censure in his *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas* (Palaestra 80), p. XIV, note: "Die elende Reimtechnik ist also auf Rechnung des englischen Dichters zu setzen, und einem solchen Stümper ist nicht gut zuzutrauen, dass er der Originalverfasser dieses in seiner Art vorzüglichen Stückes gewesen sei."

from Pollard's extracts only may be tempted to read, first the whole play, and then its counterpart in their own language as well.

In his *Elckerlijc*-edition De Raaf points out that in a number of passages listed by him the two texts agree rather closely whereas in others the translator appears to have permitted himself a certain amount of freedom. In dealing with the latter we must bear in mind that in all probability the form in which the original text has come down to us is not in every respect identical with that which the translator had before him; in other words, we must allow for textual corruption. No such disturbing factor seems to have operated in the following passage, which is a fair specimen of the relation between the two texts at its best:

El. 19-30

Elckerlijc leeft nu buyten sorghen.
Nochtan en weten si ghenen morghen
Ick sie wel hoe ic tvolc meer spare
Hoet meer arghert van iare te iare
Al dat op wast arghert voert
Daerom wil ic nu als behoert
Rekenninghe van elckerlijc ontfæen
Want liet ic dye werelt dus langhe staen
In desen leuen in deser tempeesten
Tvolc souden werden argher dan beesten
Ende souden noch deen den anderen eten
Myn puer gheloue is al vergheten

Ev. 40-51

Eueryman lyueth so after his owne pleasure
And yet of theyr lyfe they be not sure
I se the more that I them forbere
The worse they are from yere to yere
All that lyueth apperyth faste
Therefore I wyll in all the haste
Haue a rekenynge of euery mannes persone
For and I leue the people thus allone
In theyr lyfe and wycked tempestes
Verely they wyll be cume moche worse
[than bestes
For now one wolde by enuy another vp ete
Charyte they all do clene forgete

From a formal point of view there is little to choose between the two texts here; neither is clearly superior to the other. Still, the sequence *liet-souden-souden* in *El. 26-28-29* seems preferable to *leue-wyll-wolde* in *Ev. 47-49-51*, whereas *noch* in *Ev. 29* makes better sense in the context than *now* in *Ev. 51*. What is perhaps most striking are the identical or nearly identical rhymes in the two passages (*El. 21-22 / Ev. 42-43; El. 27-28 / Ev. 48-49; El. 29-30 / Ev. 50-51*), which would be hard to explain on the hypothesis of a common (French or Latin) original. As this point appears to have been overlooked by former investigators¹³, I will also list the other identical or nearly identical rhymes in the two plays: *El. 39-40 ghemeent-verleent / Ev. 56-7 ment-lente; El. 70-71 vergheten-weten / Ev. 86-88*¹⁴ *forget-wete; El. 151-2 sorghen-morghen / Ev. 171-2 sorow-morow; El. 234-5 noot-doot / Ev. 254-5 nede-deed; El. 542-3 beghinnen-van binnen / Ev. 574-6 begynne-within; El. 608-9 ghesont-stont / Ev. 632-3 sounde-stounde; El. 641-2 ghedaen-gaen / Ev. 671-2 do-go; El. 650-1 claer-daer / Ev. 681-2 clere-here; El. 666-7 testament-present / Ev. 697-8 testament-*

¹³ Brandl, l.c., had drawn attention to these rhymes, but only to conclude that the two plays must be closely related. "Fest steht, dass sich die beiden Stücke nahe verwandt sind, denn sie haben eine grosse Anzahl Reimwörter gemein."

¹⁴ Logeman's line numbering; a mistake for 87.

presente; *El.* 692-3 *goet-bloet* / *Ev.* 723-4 *good-blode*¹⁵; *El.* 698-9 *gaenghedaen* / *Ev.* 729-30 *go-do*; *El.* 700-1 *volbringhen-dinghen* / *Ev.* 730-1 *brynge-thynge*; *El.* 710-1 *handen-banden* / *Ev.* 739-40 *handes-bandes*; *El.* 722-3 *smerten-herten* / *Ev.* 751-2 *smarte-herte*; *El.* 756-7 *langhe-strange* / *Ev.* 782-4 *longe-stronge*. Only two of these rhymes (*El.* 27-8 / *Ev.* 48-9 and *El.* 666-7 / *Ev.* 697-8) could have been adopted from a common (French) source; the rest are inexplicable on such an assumption. But do they prove either *El.* > *Ev.* or *Ev.* > *El.*? Some of them do, I think, point to the former development as the more likely one; none of them to the reverse. To show this, we have to quote one or two passages in full:

El. 38-40

Nu vinde ick dattet als is verloren
Dat icse so costelic hadde *ghemeent*
Hoe menich goet ic hem vry heb *verleent*

Ev. 55-7

But now I se that lyke traytours deiecte
They thanke me not for the pleasure that
[I to them *ment*
Nor yet for theyr beyng that I them
[haue *lente*

Ghemeent in *El.* means 'bemind' (loved); the writer of *Ev.* took over the rhyme, but misunderstood the first rhyme-word, and made very doubtful sense of his line 56. It would be difficult, if not impossible here to invert the argument.¹⁶

The number of identical rhymes might have been even greater if the writer of *Everyman* had not often replaced the couplets of the Dutch text by other rhyme-schemes, chiefly *abab*. Once or twice he has preserved the original rhyme notwithstanding, in one case with unfortunate effect:

El. 542-4

Nu wil ic mijn penitencie *beghinne*.
Want dlicht heeft mi verlicht van *binnen*
Al sijn dese knopen strenghe ende hardt

Ev. 574-6

For now I wyll my penaunce *begynne*
This hath reioysed and lyghted my harte
Though the knottes be paynfull and harde
[within

Here again the rhyme has been preserved at the expense of the meaning; for *within* applies to *my herte*, not to the knots in *Everyman's* scourge! (Note, also, that in rendering *El.* 543 the writer of *Ev.* seems to have interpreted *verlicht* as 'relieved' instead of 'illuminated', which is the obvious meaning of the word in *El.*; and see Logeman, *Elckerlijc-Everyman*, p. 117.)

We will now compare two passages where the verbal correspondence is

¹⁵ In this instance even the complete lines are practically identical:

El. 692-3

doopsel vormsel priesterscap goet
Ende tsacrament god[s] vleesch ende bloet

Ev. 723-4

Baptym / confirmacyon / with pryesthode
[good
And the sacrament of goddes precyous
[fleshe and blode

¹⁶ That the English translator was capable of serious blunders is also shown by *Ev.* 603 *By the meane of his passyon I it craue*, which corresponds to *El.* 576 *So dat ic in sijn passie bade*. He seems to have mistaken *bade* (= bathe) for a form of *bidden* (pray). (Logeman, *Elckerlijc-Everyman*, p. 122.)

less close, and where the number of lines is not identical either. The Dutch text is probably slightly corrupt (ll. 448-9¹⁷).

El. 443-455

Heere god wie sal mi nu beraden
daer ic noch bi werde verhuecht
Niemant bat dan mijn duecht
Maer lazen si is soe teer van leden
Ic meen si niet connen en sou van der steden
Och en sal ic haer nyet toe dorren spreken
Wil ic? neen ick! ick sal nochtans;
Tvare alst mach. ic moet er henen
Waer sidi mijn duecht

Duecht

Ick ligghe hier al verdwenen
Te bedde vercrepelt ende al ontset
Ick en kan gheroeren niet een let
So hebdi mi geuoecht mit uwen misdaden
Wat is v ghelieuen

Ev. 479-488

Of whome shall I now counsell take
I thynke that I shall neuer spede
Tyll that I go to my good dede
But alas she is so weke
That she can nother go nor speke
Yet wyll I ventre on her now
My good dedes where be you

Good dedes

Here I ly colde in the grounde
Thy sinnes haue me so sore bounde
That I cannot stere

That the English text is shorter than the Dutch here does not, of course, prove that *Elckerlijc* was the original, *Everyman* the translation. The English text is, however, markedly inferior to the Dutch. *El. 446-7: Maer lazen si is soe teer van leden / Ic meen si niet connen en sou vander steden* has dwindled down to *But alas she is so weke / That she can nother go nor speke*, where the last two words are a mere rhyme-tag without regard to meaning: for immediately after Good Deeds does speak! Perhaps *speke* was suggested by *spreken* at the end of *El. 448*. Of *Elckerlijc*'s hesitation: *Och en sal ic haer nyet toe dorren spreken / Wil ic? neen ick! ick sal nochtans; / Tvare alst mach. ic moet er henen* nothing is left in the English text. Furthermore, if Good Deeds is weak, it is reasonable that she should lie in bed *verdwenen* (wasted), *vercrepelt* (crippled) *ende al ontset* (out of joint), but not that she should *ly colde in the grounde*, which is rather the condition of the dead. One fails to see how a Dutch translator could have developed his own satisfactory text from such a poor model as the passage before us; the presumption is that the better text was the original, the inferior one an inadequate translation.

The artistic superiority of the Dutch text is nowhere more evident than in the three elaborately rhymed stanzas with a refrain of *El. 549-77* and in the two triolets of *El. 837-53*. This point has, however, been so fully discussed by Logeman, Manly, Willems and Muller that I refrain from going into details. Manly's conclusion (*l.c.*, p. 270) seems inescapable: "The English passages corresponding to these do not present any notable variations from the prevailing rather irregular mode of rhyming. It seems

¹⁷ It has been proposed to restore the rhyme by reading:
Och en sal ic haer nyet dorren spreken an
Wil ic? neen ick! ick sal nochtan.

hardly possible that a translator would, or indeed could, have erected on the basis of the English such elaborate structures as these stanzas and triolets, whereas nothing would be simpler or more likely than that a translator, with the Dutch before him, should overlook or disregard the elaborate structural features of his original." It is strange that De Raaf, who put together three passages of two lines each to show that the Dutch translation was aesthetically inferior to the English, should have failed to draw attention to the passages to which Manly refers.

Another proof of the Englishman's inferior verbal skill, which no one, to my knowledge, has pointed out so far, is afforded by *El.* 780-842 as compared with *Ev.* 808-871. Elckerlijc, about to die, is abandoned successively by Beauty, Strength, Discretion and Five Wits. This idea is expressed by the following verbs:

<i>El.</i> 780 begheuen	—	<i>Ev.</i> 808 forsake	<i>El.</i>	—	—	<i>Ev.</i> 851 forsaken
782 ontgaen	—	810 for sake	824 beswijken	—	—	853 forsake
786 ontgaen	—	—	827 ontgaen	—	—	850 forsaken
799 (vliegheit)	—	829 forsaketh	829 begheuen	—	—	858 forsake
—	—	832 leue	838 vliet	—	—	868 forsake
—	—	833 forsake	842 liet	—	—	871 forsake
817 ontweruen	—	846 forsake				

Where the Dutch text employs six or seven different words, the English text, with one exception, monotonously repeats the verb *forsake*, as if no stylistic variant were available.

We have seen that as a versifier the writer of *Everyman* is not the equal of his Dutch colleague. His rendering often lacks the pithiness of the original.¹⁸ When Fellowship refuses to make good his promise to accompany Everyman, the latter complains:

El. 258-65

Och dat is een sober bescheen
 Gheselle ghi wilt anders dan ick
 Alst noot is
 Gheselle peyst om trouwe die groot is
 Die wi deen den anderen beloeft hebben
 Ouer menich iaer

Gheselschap

Trou hier trou daer
 Ic en wilder niet aen daer mede gesloten

Ev. 283-8

O that is a symple aduyse in dede
 Gentyll felawe helpe me in my necessytye
 We haue loued longe and now I nede
 And now gentyll felawship remembre me

Felawe.

Whether ye haue loued me or no
 By saynt Johā I wyll not with the go

The English writer also misses out picturesque and poetical lines in his original, as:

¹⁸ Brandl, l.c.: "Der englische Text lässt nach meinem Gefühl manchen Gedanken und kräftigen Ausdruck vermissen, der im holländischen steht, während sich die englischen Zuthaten ... nicht besonders passend ausnehmen."

El. 248-51

Gheselschap

Waert te drincken een goet ghelaghe
 Ick ghinc met v totten daghe
 Oft waert ter kermissen buten der stede
 Oft daer die schone vrouwen waren

Ev. 272-4

Felawe.

And yet / yf ^uy wylt^e ete and drynke and
 [make good chere
 Or haunte to women / that lusty cumpany
 I wolde not forsake you / whyle the daye
 [is, clere

(*totten daghe* is obviously not *whyle the daye is clere*, but 'till daybreak'!)

Another instance :

El. 797-8

Wie wil hem verlaten op zijn cracht
 Si vliet als mist doet wter gracht

Ev. 827-8

He that trusteth in his strength
 She hym deceyueth at the length

It seems as though, in order to make up for his deficiency in poetical and stylistic power, the writer of *Everyman* tried to improve upon his original by introducing certain embellishments of his own devising, and by heightening the sober way of expression of *Elckerlijc* here and there. It has already been remarked that for the rhyming couplet of *El.*, *Ev.* often substitutes *abab*; *abba* also occurs, as well as more complicated schemes (see, e.g., *Ev.* 22-39). Sometimes imperfect rhymes occur (*swete-wepe*, *respyte-secke* (= sick), *done-come*, *hate-take*, *eke-fete*, *take it-respyte*, *cume-euerychone*), but these were probably not meant as embellishments. In various places, too, the writer of *Everyman* has tried to tone up the text of *Elckerlijc*. In *Ev.* 79 Death threatens to strike the lover of riches *In hell for to dwell*; there is no mention of hell in the corresponding passage of *El.* Similarly *Ev.* 82: *His mynde is on flesshely lustes* — not in *El.* In *Ev.* 108 Death, to rub it in properly, speaks of *Thy many badde dedes and good but a few*; in *El.* Man must only *Rekenninghe doen*. And in the worlde *eche lyuyng creature / For adams synne must dye of nature* (*Ev.* 144-5) is not in *El.* either. Nor does *Elckerlijc* complain: *For now I fere paynes huge and great* (*Ev.* 191) — or: *For I haue a great enemy that hath me in wayte* (*Ev.* 334). Hell is mentioned again in *Ev.* 618 (*To saue me from hell and from the fyre*¹⁹ — not in *El.*) and in *Ev.* 703 (*the fende of hell*), where *El.* 672 has simply *den viant*. The only times hell is mentioned in *El.* are when *Gheselschap* promises *Ic gae met v al waert in die helle* (212), and when *Elckerlijc* reminds him of his promise in 235-6. *Everyman* preserves the word on both occasions, of course.

The English writer is not averse from parading a little learning either. *El.* 224 *Voer den hoochsten coninc almachtich* becomes *Ev.* 245 *Before the hye Iuge adonay*; *El.* 373 *voerden ouersten heeren*, *Ev.* 407 *Before the hyghest luypter of all*; *Ev.* 787 introduces *Iudas machabe*. Perhaps to atone for his failure to render the stanzaic form of the Dutch triolets, the writer of *Everyman* gives Christ's dying words in Latin (886-7), besides introducing another Latin text in his epilogue.

¹⁹ The other old editions of *Everyman* read: *To saue me from purgatory that sharp fyre*.

We come to the final count in our indictment. Before setting to work, the English translator may be supposed to have read his original two or three times and to have had the main points of the action in his mind. Knowing what was to come, however, he has sometimes anticipated, and thereby impaired the logical sequence of the dialogue. Thus in *Ev.* 142 Death advises Everyman: *And proue thy frendes yf thou can* (no corresponding line in *El.*). But there seems no reason why Death should offer such advice. In *El.* the idea is Elckerlijc's own: *en soudic niemant cleyn noch groot / Daer moghen leyden had ict te doene* (136-7), which *Ev.* renders by *Shall I haue no company fro this vale terestyall* (156) — a question which comes a little strangely after Death's suggestion in l. 142. Similarly in *Ev.* 323 Kynred and Cosyn offer Everyman their support, and Cosyn asks him to *declare / Yf ye be dysposed to go ony whether* (no corresponding line in *El.*); but it is not clear where Cosyn got the idea that Everyman was contemplating a journey. It is only in ll. 301-2 (*Ev.* 329-31) that Everyman tells them of his summons, and only in l. 312 (*Ev.* 343) that he asks them to accompany him. Cosyn's question at *Ev.* 323 is premature. Good Dedes makes the same mistake in *Ev.* 495: *And you do by me that iournaye with you wyl I take* (not in *El.*) — before Everyman has said anything about a journey. *I pray the to go with me* (497; *El.* 460-1) comes from Everyman presently, to which Good Dedes replies: *I wolde full fayne but I cannot stonde verely*. Why then her unasked-for eagerness in *Ev.* 495? — Less harm is done when *For ioye I wepe* (*Ev.* 537; not in corresponding line of *El.*) seems to anticipate *Van blijscappen ic weene* in *El.* 603.

It has been our aim to show, first, that the two plays cannot have been translated from a common original in Latin or French, the corollary being, in view of their close agreement, that one must be a translation of the other; secondly, that the English text is, on the whole, inferior to the Dutch, and that most of the differences are explicable only on the supposition that the Dutch play is the original. To lead up to this conclusion, it is not necessary to join Brandl and Wood in calling the writer of *Everyman* a bungler; the English text is not entirely without merit, though for the purpose of our argument we have had to draw attention mainly to its imperfections. As frequently happens, though most of the spade-work on a literary problem may have been done by American or continental scholarship, yet the best evaluation from a literary point of view comes from an English pen. In the present case we cannot do better than finish by quoting A. W. Pollard's words on *Everyman* in the Introduction to his *Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse* (1903), where those who are shy of archaic English may find a modernized text:

Chiefly because of the interest which has been aroused by its recent performance, I have preferred to give that of *The Summoning of Everyman*, which, while presenting much less variety than such plays as *The Castle of Perseverance*, or *Mind, Will, and Understanding*, has the merit of being in very easy English, short, impressive, and homogeneous. It is

these latter merits, quite as much as the evidence which can be obtained by comparing the two texts, that offer the best reason for acquiescing in the verdict that the Dutch play of *Elckerlijc*, attributed to Petrus Dorlandus²⁰, a theological writer of Diest, who died in 1507, has a better claim than our English version to be considered the original. Strict adherence to propriety of form was not a characteristic of the dramatic literature of this period, and had the play been of native origin its uniform seriousness of tone would almost assuredly have been broken by some humorous, or semi-humorous, episodes. While the two plays, with the exception of the Prologue, which is not found in the Dutch, agree speech by speech from beginning to end, the English version is not a slavish translation; indeed, the ease and happiness of the diction, and the freedom with which it moves, give it, *until the Dutch text is examined*,²¹ the tone of an original work, and the translator must have been a man of no small ability to achieve such a success. (p. xvii.)

We may as well leave it at that; we should have overshot our mark if we had given the impression that for those who have access to *Elckerlijc*, *Everyman* is not worth reading. The effect produced by a good performance of either play will probably be much the same. For an entertaining account of the impression made by Rooyaards' performance of *Elckerlijc* on a Brussels professor of Greek in 1900 the reader is referred to Willems' *Elckerlijc-Studiën*, 182-5.

Groningen.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

Lyly and Pettie

In his review of Hartman's edition of *A Petite Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure* (E. S., Aug. 1940) Professor Zandvoort suggested that a close comparison between the style of the *Petite Pallace* and that of *Euphues* might yield interesting results. The following observations are offered as a result of such a comparison.

The style of Lyly's *Euphues* (1578-1580), commonly called Euphuism, has been definitively analysed by M. W. Croll in his edition of *Euphues* (New York and London, 1916). For those who have no access to Croll's edition we will quote his principal conclusions:

... Euphuism is a style characterized by the figures known in ancient and mediæval rhetoric as *schemes* (*schemata*), and more specifically by the word-schemes (*schemata verborum*), in contrast with those known as *tropes*; that is to say, in effect, by the figures of sound, or vocal ornament. The most important of these figures are three which can be used, and in Euphuism are often and characteristically used, in combination in the same form of words: first, isocolon, or equality of members (successive phrases or clauses of about the same *length*); secondly, parison, or equality of sound (successive or corresponding members of the same *form*, so that word corresponds to word, adjective

²⁰ Cf. note 6.

²¹ Our italics.

to adjective, verb to verb, etc.); thirdly, paromoion, similarity of sound between words or syllables, usually occurring between words in the same positions in parisonic members, and having the form either of *alliteration*, similarity at the beginning, or *homoioteleuton* (*similiter cadentes* or *desinentes*), similarity at the end, or, as often in Euphuism, of both of these at once. Other *schemata* are also frequently and characteristically used, such as simple *word-repetition*, and *polyptoton* (the repetition of the same stem two or more times within the same clause or sentence, each time with a different inflectional ending); but these need not be detailed. The essential feature of the style — to repeat — is a vocal, or oral, pattern, and all its other characteristics, such as the use of antithesis, and the constant use of simile, are only means by which the Euphuist effects his various devices of sound design. (pp. xv-xvi.)

It has been shown that these devices are not confined to *Euphues*. They occur in Pettie's *Petite Pallace* (1576), and to a lesser degree in earlier writers, as Ascham and Fisher. Ultimately they descend from the Greek oratorical school of Gorgias.

The appearance of the Gorgianic figures in English vernacular literature involved a problem. Classic influence may be expected in the Renaissance, and Cicero and especially Isocrates have been suggested as the models of Euphuism, although neither of these had a style comparable to that of *Euphues*. It is the great merit of Croll that he has been able to show a more direct influence. This is found in a kind of prose in which the formal elements of rhetoric are strongly represented, the medieval Latin schematic prose, which ran on into the sixteenth century. As Croll expressed it:

... Euphuism is not the product of humanistic imitation of the ancients, ... it is, on the other hand, a survival of the 'rhetoric of the schools'. The *schemata* of medieval Latin, revived by being translated into the popular speech, enjoyed a brief new career of glory, to fall into their final disgrace and desuetude before the conquering advance of naturalism and modern thought at the end of the sixteenth century. The humanists often tried to check their course, or confine their use within the limits of good taste; but they failed of their purpose, first, because the study of rhetoric, which they advocated as the best approach to the classical mind, often proved to be in effect merely a school for the practice of the *schemata*, and, secondly, because the authors whom they imitated might be used to sanction the same figures. (p. lxiv.)

A slight imperfection of Croll's theory is that it makes no mention of Italian influences on Euphuism. These had received little attention until Miss V. M. Jeffery, in *John Lyly and the Italian Renaissance* (Paris, 1929)¹ attempted a revision of the case for the Italians. The parallels she points out are of matter, not of style, and they are considerably more numerous in Lyly's plays than in *Euphues* itself; but there is in her book so much evidence of Lyly's debt to Italian literary conventions and traditions that they can no longer be excluded from the history of Euphuism. It might be argued that style and matter are different things, as no doubt theoretically they are; but in practice we see that Italian influences played their part in the creation of *Euphues*. Euphuism and its enormous success can only be accounted for if, together with its history, we keep in mind the

¹ Reviewed in E. S. XII (1930) 40-41.

demand that existed in Lyly's day for Italian elegance. Only then do we see that Euphuism must have seemed to the contemporary reader at once a not wholly unfamiliar and yet a novel and elegant way of writing, and therefore extremely satisfactory.

As we have already stated, Euphuistic features were not uncommon in sixteenth century prose. Pettie, however, was the first to use the schemes to such an extent that we may speak of a Euphuistic style. It was on his example that Lyly modelled the style of his *Euphues*. The *Petite Pallace* is a collection of short stories, and as such very different from *Euphues*, which is after all a novel. All Pettie's stories are written according to one scheme. They consist of an introduction, composed very euphuistically indeed, a story from classic sources — a saint's life is the only exception — and a moral ending. As a writer Pettie is inferior to Lyly. At best he is a well-meaning amateur, whereas Lyly is an artist. This difference is best seen from the treatment of characters in the two books.

Pettie loves to give cultured speeches to all his characters, from assassin to king. What is worse, even the contents of the various monologues and conversations lack any indication of the personalities represented. Pettie's characters are mere types, as the irate father, the disappointed lover, and their state of mind is displayed almost exclusively in monologues, exhibiting in well defined stages the good and bad side of the case and the solution chosen. Even the conversation sometimes consists of monologues of this kind.

In an introductory letter Pettie asserts that some of his friends have been introduced into his stories. If this is true, it must be a matter of situation rather than character; Pettie might well say that in his stories his friends "are so darkly figured forth, that only they whom they touch, can understand whom they touch."

Lyly's characters also speak the same language. But his heroes and heroines are all of practically the same social level and high culture, so that it is not at all surprising that they should speak the same "jargon". And beneath the intricate patterns of their conversation there is often a hint of personal character. One cannot read the story of Fidus in *Euphues and his England* without acquiring the conviction that Iffida is a cat. Lyly's use of monologue is less clumsy than Pettie's. Besides, Lyly occasionally has the grace to render a piece of natural conversation, e.g. :

"I know not how I should commend your beauty, because it is somewhat too brown, nor your stature, being somewhat too low, and of your wit I can not judge." "No," quoth she, "I believe you. For none can judge of wit but they that have it." (p. 262; all references are to Croll's edition.)

For all we know it may have been a stock joke in Lyly's day, but it has the merit of the natural tone. It is not difficult to imagine living people behind these words. Only once does Pettie slip into a phrase of this kind, and it is typical of his capacities that not one of his characters is the living person behind it, but the author himself :

But here he aptly ended his talk upon her mouth, and they entered into such privy conference, their lips being joined most closely together, that I cannot report the meaning of it unto you, but if it please one of you to lean hitherward a little, I will show you the manner of it. (Pettie, p. 137; references are to Hartman's edition.)

Quis sapiens blandis non misceat oscula verbis?

The personalities of our two authors are very different indeed. This comes out strikingly in their attitudes towards women. Lyly is courtly and Italianate where women are concerned. Pettie on the other hand has long misogynist tirades, and is given to moralizing on the duties of a good wife. Among these obedience to her husband figures conspicuously. Indeed we may say that Lyly has a renaissance mentality, whereas Pettie's mind is built on more medieval lines.

In the stylistic field this difference may also be observed. There is in Pettie's use of rhetorical devices a lack of restraint that we do not find in Lyly. Pettie has seen fit to repeat the word "wish" no less than seven times in one sentence (p. 146); we may come across endless strings of if-clauses or sentences, and there is one string of 31 how-clauses following a sentence that has 12 times "how.." and 3 times "what..". In *Euphuës* we may find short strings of if-clauses, but they are not comparable in length to Pettie's.

Generally speaking, however, the stylistic differences are small and chiefly a matter of frequency of occurrence of the devices used. A close comparison of the two styles could, therefore, only be effected by means of statistics. It was possible and justifiable to employ this method because the formal elements play such an important part in Euphuism.

As we have seen, the devices used in Euphuism are three: isocolon, parison and paramoion. The frequency of isocolon and parison, however, depends very much upon the thoughts expressed, and among other things the choice of our material might influence our figures out of all proportion. The counting of isocolon and parison, therefore, could not yield reliable results and has been dropped. In this way we were left only with paramoion, but fortunately this term includes quite a number of characteristic figures. Some of these, as word-repetition, are not necessarily independent of the thought, but in Euphuism the word-patterns are ubiquitous and their use is purely mechanical. For clearness' sake it will be best to define the various devices and illustrate the definitions by examples.

Alliteration: similarity of initial sounds of stressed syllables or words. For our purpose it may be divided into:

Dispersed alliteration: the alliterating letters are distributed over a clause or sentence: And in this journey I found good fortune so favourable ... (Lyly, p. 254.)

Patterned alliteration: the alliterating letters belong to words in similar positions in corresponding word-groups, but in each word-group only one letter is used: So that this only choice is left for me either to die desperately, or to live loathsomely. (Pettie, p. 94.)

Transverse alliteration; two or more alliterating letters distributed over corresponding word-groups are repeated alternately: ... and love, desired in the bud, not knowing what the blossom were, may delight the conceits of the head but it will destroy the contemplature of the heart. (Lyly, p. 250.)

Reversed alliteration; two or more alliterating letters in a word-group are repeated in reversed order in a second word-group: and could he dote so much of a light damsel, to force so little of his loving father? (Pettie, p. 140.)

Annomination: similarity of consonantal sound plus difference in vowels: Which events being so strange, I had rather leave them in a *muse* what it should be, than in a *maze* in telling what it was. (Lyly, p. 89.)

Assonance: similarity of vowels: But I will ease him of his labour ere it be long, for this life I am not able to endure long. (Pettie, p. 135.)

Consonance: similarity at once of consonantal sounds and vowels: Here, yea here, Euphues, mayest thou see, not the carved *visard* of a lewd woman, but the incarnate *visage* of a lascivious wanton. (Lyly, p. 16.)

Polyptoton: the repetition of the same stem two or more times, each time with a different prefix or suffix (a wider definition than Croll's, and more in keeping with the English language): Is thy Livia turned to my Lucilla, thy love to my lover, thy devotion to my saint? (Lyly, p. 73.)

Repetition: the recurrence of words: For what *life* (alas) in this *life* is to be counted *life* without his *life* and love? (Pettie, p. 182.)

Rime: similarity of all but initial sounds: I will to Athens, there to toss my *books*, no more in Naples to live with fair *looks*. (Lyly, p. 85.)

The terminology and definitions are mostly Child's.

The frequency of occurrence of these devices we counted for certain equal passages. These have been chosen with care from the middle of each book. In our choice we have been guided by several considerations, the most important being that the contents should show as little difference as possible. It was found that in the *Petite Pallace* the story of Admetus and Alcest was most suitable. From *Euphues* we selected the story of Fidus in *Euphues and his England*, because it is more or less a short story, and because it contains an aside to the reader and a piece of moralizing which are not far removed in spirit from Pettie's introductions and final flourishes.

The influence of the contents on the style having been reduced to a minimum, we still had to decide how to equalize the quantity in the two authors. The counting of pages or sentences is far too inaccurate, especially as Pettie has evidently much longer sentences than Lyly. We therefore found ourselves obliged to equalize the two passages by means of the number of words. Pettie's story is the shorter, and we have taken from Lyly only as much as is necessary to get a number of words equal to that of "Admetus and Alcest".

The total number of words for each passage is also a very useful figure

with regard to alliteration. The frequency of this device is evidently best represented by expressing it in a percentage of the total number of words.

Since we had to count words, we thought it best also to note the numbers of words contained in each sentence, so that we should be able to show statistically the difference in length of the sentences in Lyly and in Pettie. There is a difference in the editions used, however, which influences the outcome of these statistics. Croll's edition is a modernized one, whereas Hartman's is not. The result is that our text of Pettie contains fewer full stops than we should wish. We have reduced this difference by regarding in Pettie a semi-colon or colon followed by a capital as a full stop. Further interference did not seem necessary and indeed would hardly be justified.

Pettie's story contains 6648 words; the first full stop in *Euphues* after this total was reached occurred at 6654 words. At once we found our expectations realized, for Lyly has 208 sentences to his total, as against Pettie 146. After bringing up the total in each case to 250 sentences, we found that only 5 % of Lyly's sentences exceed 65 words; in Pettie nearly $\frac{1}{5}$ of the total number of sentences are longer than 65 words (18 %).

In order to arrive at a better insight into the distribution of sentences we constructed a graph.² Using as abscissus the length of sentence, and as ordinate the frequency of occurrence, we get a rectangle for each length of sentence, the height of which depends on the number of cases counted. The result is a so-called pseudo-histogram. The two pseudo-histograms did not tell us much more about the difference in extreme lengths of sentences. They had, however, a strange peculiarity in that the distribution seemed to point to a certain periodicity. This we thought rather remarkable, because one would expect something not very unlike a Normal curve.³ In view of the periodicity, it seemed, the best representation would be a series of Normal curves, partly overlapping. The modes³ of these curves would indicate the length of the period. Because of the irregularity of the pseudo-histograms it was impossible to indicate the modes directly. We therefore employed a device enabling us to regularize the whole without changing the principle of distribution. This device is based on the idea that a sentence of exactly n words is a product of chance, and might as well have been one or two words longer or shorter. Each sentence of n words is, therefore, counted not only with the abscissus n , but also with $n + 2$, $n + 1$, $n - 2$, and $n - 1$. The numbers on the ordinate then no longer indicate absolute frequency, but are purely relative.

The resulting curves show a clear periodicity in both cases. Lyly's curve has three marked tops at 16, $26\frac{1}{2}$ and 39 words, and in rapid decline

² The graph and the statistical materials cannot be reproduced here, but may be inspected by anyone interested at the English seminar of the University of Groningen.

³ Normal curve (Du. toevalskromme): curve representing accidental distribution of data, as obtained, e.g., by measuring the height of trees.

Mode: top of a Normal curve.

Scatter (Du. spreiding): the actual data will seldom be found to conform to the theoretically correct curve; they are scattered about it.

two further tops at $50\frac{1}{2}$ and $61\frac{1}{2}$ words. The distances between these modes are $10\frac{1}{2}$, $12\frac{1}{2}$, $11\frac{1}{2}$ and 11 words. This means that Lyly shows a remarkable preference for ending a sentence at certain points, and that having once passed such a point, the chances are that he will add another 11 words.

The explanation is simple: Lyly practised isocolon. When we tried to verify this explanation by pointing out an 11-word isocolon in *Euphues*, we found that Lyly's isocolon is much shorter. A good example is (p. 271):

A phrase now there is	5
which belongeth to your shop-board	5
that is "to make love";	5
and when I shall hear	5
of what fashion it is made	6
if I like the pattern	5
you shall cut me a partlet	6
— so as you cut it not	6
with a pair of left-handed shears	6

In this sentence, belonging to the $50\frac{1}{2}$ group, the average length of the phrases is 5.5 words. The distance between our modes averages 11 words. Apparently the periodicity of Lyly's curve is due to a preference for two of these short phrases together. Such a preference can only be reasonably explained by assuming that he makes use of parisonic clauses or phrases, usually in couples. There is, of course, a good deal of variation, indicated by the scatter³ about our modes; this is only to be expected. But Lyly's preference for five-word isocola in parisonic couples is strong enough to find expression in our graph.

A curious feature is that the chief modes are situated at 16, $26\frac{1}{2}$ and 39 words. According to our explanation this would indicate a preference for an uneven number of phrases. This is not improbable, because very often we see the author introducing some sort of object or topic for his parisonic phrases. If the introductory sentences were evenly distributed, that is to say if there were an equal number of such clauses for each length from one to six words, we should not see any periodicity at all. In that case the ends of the sentences would differ only slightly with regard to each other, because sentences of an equal period had been spread out. A more or less smooth curve would have been the result. Fortunately we have been saved by the isocolonic tendency which causes the introductory clause to become one more member of a balanced sentence, its contribution being that the modes are seen five or six words further on, at an "uneven" period. Examples of sentences with introductory clauses are (Lyly, p. 256):

Thus to excuse myself of unkindness	6
you have made me almost impudent	6
and I you (I fear me) impatient,	7
in seeming to prescribe a diet	6
where there is no danger,	5
giving a preparative	3
when the body is purged.	5

And (ibid.):

I seeing myself thus ridden	5
thought either she should sit fast	6
or else I would cast her	6

At a first glance it is doubtful whether the modes at $50\frac{1}{2}$ and $61\frac{1}{2}$ indicate an even or an uneven period. In view of the fact that in most cases we have found a mean length of phrase of 5.5 words, an even period is unlikely. Besides we should expect long sentences to have rather long phrases as they move more slowly than sentences of average length.

In Pettie's curve we see a number of gradually decreasing peaks. The modes are, however, less easily determined than in Lyly's case. They are situated at about 19, 36, 53, 69 and 87 words. The mode at 69 words is not clearly marked; it is dissolved into a number of small tops, a marked one at 64 words — which may not belong to this mode — and two more solid tops at 68 and 71. The modes are about 17 words apart. We may suppose that Pettie's "standard" isocolon is a little longer than Lyly's, 8.5 words, and that here too we have to do with a period of double phrase-length. When we start looking for Pettie's isocolon we do find an average of about 8.5 words, but there is much more irregularity than in Lyly. An example is (p. 38):

And I would wish my gallant youths,	7
which delight to gaze in every garish glass,	8
and to have an oar stirring in every beautiful boat,	10
not to row past their reach,	6
not to fix their fancy upon impossibilities,	7
not to suffer themselves to be blasted with the beams of beauty	12
or scorched with the lightning of loving looks.	8

The modes are here situated at 19, 36, 53, 69 and 87 words. Contrary to what we saw in Lyly, we have therefore a preference for an even period. And indeed while Lyly, so to speak, needs only to be opened for us to find an example of parisonic construction with an introductory clause, examples of this kind can hardly be found in Pettie. When Pettie uses a clearly parisonic construction he seems to take pleasure in making this device clear to us as soon as possible (p. 127):

Now Lycabas either thinking he had him at some advantage,	10
either not minding to put up injuries before received,	9
would accept no conditions of peace	6
but by Admetus sent his father flat defiance.	8

It need hardly be stated that our former objection to the counting of isocolon and parison does not hold good here. We have not counted the frequency of these devices; we have merely shown the general preference for them in the two authors, and the difference between them in this respect. It may, however, be asked if there are no other peculiarities that can produce a periodicity, and if such a periodicity occurs in other non-

Euphuistic writers. For comparison we counted 250 sentences from V. Sackville-West's story "Her Son" (Albatross book of short stories p. 303) and treated them in the same way. The resulting curve showed one high peak at 13 words and a slight one at 26. We know, therefore, that at least one writer has no periodicity. Besides, the evidence that in our case we have struck the right explanation — even if a similar state of things in other writers would have to be explained differently — is fairly convincing.

Summarizing the results of this part of our comparison we may say that Lyly employs isocolon of a shorter type than Pettie, and uses parison and isocolon with greater regularity. (In the curves this appears from the fact that there is less scatter about the modes in Lyly's case than in Pettie.) Further Lyly has a preference for an introductory remark with his parisonic sentences, of a length with the other phrases, whereas Pettie starts his parison without any preambles.

In the counting of alliterations and some of the other word-patterns there is a subjective factor, and a margin for inaccuracy must be allowed. There is, however, no reason to suppose that any essential changes in our figures would have to be made after a second counting.

The total numbers of alliteration for Lyly are: dispersed, 555; patterned (transverse and reversed inclusive) 209; and for Pettie: dispersed 772, patterned (transv. & rev. incl.) 286. A considerable percentage of the total number of words alliterate: 764, or about 11.5 % in Lyly, and 1058, or nearly 16 % in Pettie. Whereas Lyly's total is less than Pettie's his number of non-dispersed alliterations is 36 %, or more than a third of the total, as against 27 % for Pettie. The intricate transverse and reversed alliterations are not very frequent; they form hardly 2 % of all the non-dispersed alliterations in Lyly and just over 0.5 % in Pettie.

It appears that Pettie, though his alliterations are far more frequent, uses comparatively little patterned alliteration, and hardly any transverse or reversed. The result of this is, as we feel when reading Pettie, that the reader is treated to quite a number of exercises in pronunciation. They are exceedingly trying and the lack of variation is very marked. Lyly, on the other hand, using less alliteration, gets about a third of it in his patterns. There is more variation, and generally speaking Lyly uses his alliteration far more than Pettie to underline his parison and isocolon.

This conclusion is stressed by two other facts. Considering the numbers of alliteration of more than two words on one letter we find:

Lyly	Pettie	cases of 3 words on one letter.							
48	80	"	"	4	"	"	"	"	"
7	32	"	"	5	"	"	"	"	"
2	10	"	"	6	"	"	"	"	"
1	1	"	"		"	"	"	"	"

There is even a case of 13 words in Pettie, in a sentence already notorious
E. S. XXIII. 1941.

for the sevenfold repetition of the word "wish". (p. 146.) And if this argument for the strong stress that Pettie lays on alliteration were insufficient, there is a second, in the alliteration of combinations of letters (*st*, *sp*, etc.). Pettie has 31 cases, that is, almost 3 % of the total, a very considerable number, far greater than that of his transverse and reversed together. Lyly has only 6, his lowest total. Digraphs have of course not been included in these numbers.

There is no difference between the two authors as regards the letters preferred for alliteration.

Finally we come to the other sound patterns. They are not very numerous; a short list of their total numbers is:

	Lyly	Pettie
Annomination	4	9
Assonance	12	9
Consonance	15	30
Polyptoton	7	15
Repetition	36	37

The only difference of any importance is found in the use of consonance. This is in accordance with Pettie's preference for a good, clear alliteration, for many of these cases are alliterating first or stressed syllables.

The only device left for discussion is rime. Here Pettie has 9 very clear instances, as against Lyly none. If we do find rime in Lyly it is either not at the end of an isocolon — as in "fast-cast her" — or it consists merely of a suffix. In the first case it is consonance rather than rime; in the second case it is not in any way conspicuous as most of Pettie's rimes are. Is it possible that Lyly, who had a more humanistic background than Pettie, had been taught to shun this most obvious of all patterns?

Little remains to be said. It is not possible to decide in how far the lack of restraint that we have seen in Pettie may be held responsible for the abundance of rhetorical figures in his style. It is an alluring thought, which would place Pettie as a slightly medieval link between a tradition of the middle ages and the renaissance mind of Lyly. Without going quite so far, however, we may say that Lyly understood the style better than Pettie. In Pettie's prose we are struck by the alliteration rather than by the balance of phrases. By restricting the alliteration, shortening the isocolon — thereby making it more obvious — and by combining parison and patterned alliteration to a higher degree than had been done by Pettie, Lyly created a systematic style, which has a certain elegance and is indeed representative of one aspect of the English Renaissance.

Notes and News

Lady Byron and Louise Swanton Belloc's *Lord Byron*

In her well documented study of Lady Byron,¹ Miss Mayne refers to a letter written May 10, 1841, in which Lady Byron states, apropos of Louise Swanton Belloc's translation of Moore's life of Byron,² that Mme Belloc had libelled her "most unsparingly" in a biography published some years previously:

Mme Mojon [writes Lady Byron] has begged me to mark the passages in Mme Belloc's work which were positive misstatements, and I felt bound to do so in relation to the calumnies of which Mrs. Clermont is the object. "*Cette mégère*" is the appellation given her.³

After quoting portions of a letter in which Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes, Louise Swanton Belloc's grand-daughter, writes: "I am *quite* sure that [my grandmother] never wrote a biography of Lady Byron My theory is that the 'biography' was an article, or perhaps a series of articles, on *Lord Byron*," Miss Mayne concludes that Lady Byron must have had the book in question in her hands, but states that neither she nor Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes had ever been able to trace any such biography.

It is surprising that it did not occur to Miss Mayne to identify the mysterious biography of Lady Byron with Mme Belloc's *Lord Byron* (2 vols.; Paris: A.-A. Renouard, 1824), particularly after Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes' hint as to the real nature of the "biography." Possibly Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes was unaware of the existence of Mme Belloc's *Lord Byron*: copies of it are comparatively rare, and there is reason to believe that Mme Belloc may have attempted to withdraw it from circulation on learning that it had given offense to Lady Byron.⁴ Nevertheless, it is listed in Quérard,⁵ in the printed catalogues of the Library of the British Museum and of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and in Edmond Estève's *Byron en France*.⁶

The passages in which Lady Byron might well have felt libelled are in fact numerous. Mme Belloc portrays her⁷ as haughty and jealous, a

¹ Ethel Colburn Mayne, *The Life and Letters of Anne Isabella, Lady Noel Byron* (New York, 1929), pp. 474-476.

² *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron, with Notices of His Life* (London, 1830), translated as *Mémoires de lord Byron, publiés par Thomas Moore; traduits de l'anglais par Madame Louise Sw.-Belloc* (5 vols.; Paris: Mesnier, 1830-1831). There are also two Belgian editions of the same dates, published by Louis Hauman et Comp^e, and by H. Tarlier and J.-P. Meline.

³ Mayne, *op. cit.*, p. 474.

⁴ From notes and unpublished material which the writer has gathered for a study of Louise Swanton Belloc.

⁵ *La Littérature française contemporaine* (Paris, 1842-57), I, 254-256.

⁶ Paris: Hachette, 1907.

⁷ Belloc, *op. cit.*, I, 55-60, 326, et *passim*.

blue-stocking and a puritan who, after first experiencing something akin to horror for Byron, later consented to meet him through curiosity, and ended by marrying him through "l'orgueil d'attacher et de fixer un homme de génie dont le nom était déjà dans toutes les bouches," — and perhaps in the hope of reforming him. The episode in which Lady Byron took such violent umbrage at the presence in her home of Mrs. Mardyn, of the Drury Lany Theater, is related in such a manner as to make Lady Byron appear utterly unreasonable and unjust, suspicious, jealous, rude and embittered :

Au lieu de l'accueillir [i.e., Mrs. Mardyn] avec bonté, elle recula de quelques pas, et lui adressa les plus amères railleries sur le but de sa visite et sur sa conduite; puis s'élançant vers la porte, elle sortit.

"The calumnies of which Mrs. Clermont is the object" are both frequent and obvious, and Mme Belloc's account of her equivocal (and, to Byron, highly objectionable) position in the Byron household contains the term "mégère" to which Lady Byron took specific exception, and which furnishes one of the clues to the identification of the "biography of Lady Byron:"

Lady Byron avait auprès d'elle son ancienne gouvernante, qu'elle regardait comme une amie, et qu'elle traitait avec beaucoup d'égards. Soit que lord Byron fût fatigué de la présence d'un tiers, soit qu'il vît avec chagrin l'influence qu'une étrangère exerçait dans sa maison, il paraît qu'il offensa grièvement l'orgueil de cette femme. C'est au moins le seul motif auquel on puisse attribuer la haine profonde et infatigable qu'elle lui montra depuis. Connaissant mieux que personne le caractère de lady Byron, elle sut faire agir à propos tous les ressorts pour exciter sa jalousie, et empoisonner son bonheur domestique. Elle attisait ses moindres ressentiments contre lord Byron. Elle noircissait par de faux rapports, et aggravait les torts qu'il pouvait avoir. L'irritabilité de ce dernier ne lui permettait pas de répondre avec calme à des reproches injustes: l'amour sincère qu'il avait pour sa femme redoublait sa fureur contre la mégère dont l'ascendant était si funeste à son repos.⁸

Furthermore, the poem in which Byron attacks with such savage and bitter scorn the woman whom he accused of breaking up his home is reproduced with an accompanying translation.⁹

The passage in Mme Belloc's biography which elicited the detailed statement of Lady Byron's financial circumstances which she inclosed in a letter to Mme Mojon, also dated May 10, 1841,¹⁰ is undoubtedly Lord Byron's statement, translated from Medwin,¹¹ in which the poet is quoted as saying :

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

⁹ "Esquisse d'une vie privée (A Sketch from Private Life)", *ibid.*, pp. 75-83.

¹⁰ Mayne, *op. cit.*, pp. 475-476. Bianca Milesi Mojon (1790-1849) was an intimate friend of Lady Byron and also of Mme Belloc, several of whose works she translated into Italian, and with whom she corresponded for many years. See [C. M. Sedgwick,] "Bianca Milesi Mojon: A Biographical Study by Emile Souvestre," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, XVI (1858), 641-653.

¹¹ *Journal of the Conversations of Lord Byron, Noted During a Residence with His Lordship in Pisa in the Years 1821 and 1822* (Paris, 1824), I, 133.

"Je ne ferai ni réclamation ni objection s'ils [Lord Dacre and Sir Francis Burdett] disposent de tout en faveur de lady Byron."

Quelques temps après, le partage ayant été fait également, il dit au capitaine Medwin: "J'ai offert à lady Byron la maison de famille en sus de sa portion, mais elle l'a refusée: cela n'est pas bien."¹²

It is to be regretted that Mme Belloc's biography of Byron and her role in familiarizing the French public of her day with the English poet's life and works were not accorded more extensive treatment in Estève's study of Byron's literary fortunes in France. Mme Belloc, who was said to resemble Byron strikingly and who appears to have been not unaware of this resemblance, published, in addition to her *Lord Byron*, a number of articles devoted to the poet or his works in the *Revue Encyclopédique* between 1819 and 1832, translations of many of Byron's poems,¹³ and a translation of Moore's *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*. One of the first full length biographies to appear in France after Byron's death, Mme Belloc's *Lord Byron* included numerous translations of his principal works, and was of considerable significance and value in spite of certain inaccuracies and misstatements.¹⁴ It made a consistent and, on the whole, successful effort to relate the poet's works to his life, and represented a conscientious attempt to dispel popular misconceptions and prejudices by gathering new materials from original documents and from Byron's friends and acquaintances. The letter from Stendhal which is reproduced in the notes¹⁵ is one of the rare instances, however, in which Mme Belloc divulges the source of previously unpublished material. The following unpublished letter from Mme Belloc to Jullien, editor of the *Revue Encyclopédique*, dated January 9, 1826, throws additional light on the published sources on which she drew:

La source à laquelle j'ai surtout puisé, et à laquelle il me semble qu'il faut surtout s'inspirer pour parler de lord Byron, ce sont les ouvrages mêmes de ce poète, et les notes de *Childe Harold* où il raconte lui même presque toutes les sensations et les événements de son premier voyage en Grèce. Je crois qu'il faudrait consulter aussi: 1° sa correspondance avec sa mère, et avec Dallas, publiée à Paris par Galignani,¹⁶ 2° les conversations du capitaine Medwin¹⁷ où il y a beaucoup de vrai mêlé à du faux, 3° le

¹² Belloc, *op. cit.*, II, 435.

¹³ [Anonymous,] *Beautés de lord Byron, ou choix de pensées et des morceaux les plus remarquables extraits de ses écrits et traduits en français; ouvrage précédé d'une notice sur le caractère et les écrits de lord Byron et orné de son portrait* (Paris: A. Eymery, 1825); "Sur lord Byron," *Annales Romantiques*, IV (1828), 105-108; *Lord Byron et Thomas Moore, poésies traduites par M. A. Pichot, Mme Belloc, M. E. Henrion, avec une notice par M. Ch. Nodier* (Paris: Bureau de la Bibliothèque choisie, 1829).

¹⁴ Lady Byron appears to have forgiven at least some of these, as she wrote that they had been made "not ... maliciously, for she [Mme Belloc] is an estimable person and full of feeling." Mayne, *op. cit.*, p. 474.

¹⁵ Belloc, *op. cit.*, I, 353-357.

¹⁶ *Correspondance de lord Byron avec un ami, et lettres écrites à sa mère en 1809, 1810 et 1811, du Portugal, de l'Espagne, de la Turquie et de la Grèce, souvenirs et observations, le tout formant une histoire de sa vie de 1808 à 1814*. Par feu R. C. Dallas (2 vols.; Paris: A. et W. Galignani, 1824).

¹⁷ Medwin, *op. cit.*

journal du capitaine Parry en Grèce:¹⁸ ouvrage fort médiocre, mais où l'on trouve aussi quelques choses intéressantes; 4° un abrégé de la vie de Byron, publié par Gordon p^r quelques anecdotes de son enfance;¹⁹ et enfin, l'ouvrage que Moore promet de donner sur Byron, et dont on assure qu'il s'occupe; mais je ne présume pas qu'il puisse paraître avant un an.

Voilà tout ce que je puis indiquer comme sources; en recommandant toujours de préférence de chercher lord Byron dans ses œuvres avant tout. C'est là qu'on le juge mieux que dans tous les commentaires sur lui.²⁰

As Mme Belloc had a wide circle of acquaintances among the French Romantics, it is not unreasonable to presume that many of them were indebted to the biographer and translator of Byron for some of their notions of the English poet.

Northwestern University.

THOMAS R. PALFREY.

Lord Byron's Name

It will no doubt have struck others, as it has struck me, that the name of Lord Byron, the Poet, is by various authors rendered in various ways.

There is the Dictionary of National Biography, which gives: *Byron*, George Gordon, sixth lord; there is the Encyclopaedia Britannica with: *Byron*, George Gordon Byron, 6th Baron; Chambers's Cyclopaedia with: *George Gordon Byron*, sixth Lord Byron of Rochdale; the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature with: *Byron*, George Gordon Noel, Lord; G. B. Harrison's Penguin Anthology 'A Book of English Poetry' with: George Gordon Noel Byron, Lord Byron (single instance found); and finally, to confuse things a little more, there is W. E. Peck, who calls one of his works: 'Seventeen Letters of George Noel Gordon, Lord Byron'.

When meeting with such a variety of names one may rightly wonder, primarily, which name is the correct one, and, next, from where this assembly of different versions arises. Now to settle these two questions I will here trace the different sources from which the Poet's name was derived.

With William the Conqueror there came to England from Normandy Ralph de Burun who acquired vast properties in Nottinghamshire. To these his descendants added considerable possessions in Derbyshire, later,

¹⁸ William Parry, *The Last Days of Lord Byron, with His Lordship's Opinions on Various Subjects, Particularly on the State and Prospects of Greece* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1826).

¹⁹ Sir Cosmo Gordon, *The Life and Genius of Lord Byron, with Additional Anecdotes and Critical Remarks from Other Publications; To Which is Prefixed a Sketch on Lord Byron's Death*, by Sir Walter Scott (Paris: Baudry, 1824).

²⁰ Bibliothèque de La Rochelle, MS 609.

under Edward I, the lands of Rochdale in Lancashire, whilst Henry VIII granted them the church and priory of Newstead with the lands adjoining.

The Byrons were a valiant cavalier family, and in 1643 Sir John Biron was created Baron Byron of Rochdale. The Poet's father was the eldest son of Admiral Byron who in his turn was the second son of the fourth lord. Thus when in 1794 the grandson of the fifth lord, who was then his only surviving male descendant, died at the siege of Calvi in Corsica, the future Poet was the next heir and subsequently became sixth lord in 1798 on the death of his grand-uncle.

The Poet's father, Captain John Byron, had married at Bath on 13 May, 1785, Miss Catherine Gordon of Gicht, his second wife, and on 22 January, 1788, their only child was born in Holles Street, London.

The boy was christened George, after his grandfather on the maternal side, to which was added the name of Gordon, in compliance with a condition imposed by will on whoever should become the husband of the heiress of Gicht. At the baptism the Duke of Gordon and Colonel Duff of Fetteresso stood godfathers.¹

2 January, 1815, Byron married at Seaham, Durham, Anne Isabella Milbanke, only daughter of Sir Ralph Milbanke by Judith, daughter of Thomas Noel, Baron Wentworth of Kirkby Mallory. The Wentworth barony had come into the Noel family in 1745. When Lord Wentworth died in April 1815 the principal part of his property devolved upon Lady Milbanke and Lady Byron, and in compliance with his will Sir Ralph and Lady Milbanke changed their names to Noel. The Wentworth barony devolved upon Lady Noel (late Milbanke), it appears, and at her death in February 1822 upon Lady Byron. Her will, by a condition similar to that in Lord Wentworth's, obliged Lord and Lady Byron to take the Noel name, so that from this moment onwards both wrote themselves 'Noel Byron'. (It will be remembered that Byron was separated, but never divorced from his wife.) In a letter from Pisa, dated February 19, 1822, Byron writes: "My agents and trustees have written to me to desire that I would take the name directly, so that I am yours very truly and affectionately, 'Noel Byron'."; and in another, dated from Pisa, February 28, 1822, he writes: "My lawyers are taking out a licence for the name and arms, which it seems I am to endue".² Ever afterwards he writes and signs himself 'Noel Byron'.

I think this accounts sufficiently for the variety of names mentioned above. It shows that the family name was *Byron*, not Gordon or Noel, that the Noel name was acquired in later life, and that it is a surname, not a Christian name. As to the inserting or leaving out of Noel the writer may, to a certain extent, please himself, the name having been used by Byron only during the last two years of his life and not having belonged to him originally. On the other hand I think it is almost customary to mention a man by the name he last went by, and from 1822 until his death

¹ Moore, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, Vol. I, p. 12.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 352, 353.

the name Noel was legally his and was used by him as such, as is shown not only by his signatures, but also, e.g., by the official Italian account of Shelley's cremation, where he is mentioned as 'his Excellency Lord Noel Byron, an English peer.'³

His official and complete names and title, therefore, lastly were: *George Gordon Noel Byron, 6th Baron Byron of Rochdale*.

Groningen.

JOH. GERRITSEN.

War Words: Further Comments. Concerning *escapist* and related words, Dr. G. Kirchner (Jena) draws our attention to a leading article of *The Times* of 21-8-1937, p. 11, entitled "Escapes and Discoveries". As this reference may be valuable to future students we register it here, adding the following extract kindly furnished by Dr. Kirchner:

... the word 'escapist' employed in this context descriptively and without moral comment, is often used nowadays as a term of abuse. In literary criticism and in political discussion it has begun to be used thoughtlessly or venomously as part of the invective of those who wish it to be understood ...

★

Mr. A. van Wijngaarden, of Dordrecht, informs us that he heard the expression *skeleton service* used in London a few years ago by a plain man waiting for a bus which failed to come. "It's a regular skeleton service", he complained. We now find that the expression was already registered in the 12th edition of Ten Bruggencate's English-Dutch dictionary (1932), so that it has to go among the "other neologisms".

Granville-Barker on Phonetic Alphabet. "No instrument can be made to compete in variety and significance of expression with the cultured human voice naturally used. Nor, surely, can any system of notation, any conceivable combination of symbols be devised which will represent the scope of its resources. The usual phonetic alphabet very certainly does not. Whatever the uses of this may be (it was a practical means of recording living speech till the gramophone superseded it), a language learnt by reliance on it is bound to be inexpressively spoken, if nothing further is done which may set the ear and tongue free from its restraints. *A man who has learnt a language phonetically speaks it as a deaf man does.* A student must hear the music of a language, and the best thing

³ Trelawny, *Records of Shelley, Byron and the Author*, p. 261; (stated to be the official English translation of the Italian document).

is probably to set him searching for it; for its melodies and cadences in its poetry, and, where English is concerned, in dramatic poetry, since there melody and cadence are at their freest and most characteristic."

(*Prefaces to Shakespeare* by HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER. Third Series: *Hamlet*. 2nd impression, 1937. Pp. 218-19, note. Italics not in the original.)

J. Kooistra †. The late J. Kooistra, who died at The Hague on January 7, aged 51, combined a mastery of modern English such as few foreigners ever attain to with an equally exceptional knowledge and appreciation of English literature. To *English Studies* he contributed articles on "The Pan-erotic Element in Shelley", together with a Shelley-bibliography, in 1922; "On the Character of Desdemona", 1923; on *Saint Joan*, 1925; and on Aldous Huxley, 1931. A note on "Shakespeare in English Literature of 1922" appeared in *E. S.* in that year, while a dozen reviews between 1923 and 1937 testified to his grasp of widely different subjects. It was as a literary critic that he chiefly excelled, and his work as such, though small in compass, has not been bettered among students of English in Holland.

Reviews

The Formation and Use of Compound Epithets in English Poetry from 1579. By BERNARD GROOM. (S.P.E. Tract no. XLIX.) Pp. 295-322. At the Clarendon Press. 1937. Price 2 s. 6d.

The subject offers little scope for sweeping theories or principles of wide range. On the contrary; it pins one down to a laborious preparatory toil, not unlike that of the compiler of a concordance, in order to obtain possession of the data on which subsequently a sort of casuistry may be let loose. Now, this procedure is singularly apt to promote, if not to provoke, desultoriness and inconsistency, the more so when, as is the case here, the final judgment is a mere matter of personal susceptibility and response, and consequently void of any universal validity.

Mr. Groom, who has undertaken the arduous task of guiding us through the jungle of compound epithets used by the chief English poets since 1579 seems to be of an almost hypersensitive susceptibility and response in matters of poetic diction. In reading his essay one cannot always free oneself from the impression that the subject, not being of his own choosing, is uncongenial to him, and induces him to substitute an almost spasmodic emphasis for argumentative force. However, in other places he betrays a strong prejudice in favour of the compound epithet as a vehicle of poetic

thought, and warms to his subject to such an extent that his words seem to carry conviction by sheer enthusiasm.

After some preliminary remarks on the significance of the compound epithet in poetry Mr. Groom proceeds to provide us with a grammatical division of this group of adjuncts. This seems to indicate that at the outset he flattered himself with the hope of succeeding in turning out a more or less systematic treatment of the matter in hand, a hope which must soon have been shattered by the recalcitrant facts. Indeed, in the course of his essay he finds little occasion to apply this classification or advance arguments in support of the implied assertion that these different grammatical classes are also essentially different in their possibilities of literary expression.

Another, in principle less irrelevant, classification which Mr. Groom attempts, and which is based on the various poetic styles, might have contributed to an at least partly systematic treatment of the subject, if such a division were a priori possible. This, however, is extremely doubtful. The writer himself seems to be subject to such doubt, which betrays itself in a vague and hesitating handling of this matter. In one place he asserts that the compound epithets in Milton's English poems fall into three main classes: the descriptive, the mythological and the rhetorical; in another he maintains that the compound epithets (in general) may be divided in two main classes: the rhetorical or dramatic and the mythological or descriptive. And again in another place he speaks of allegorical compound epithets. Now, it is difficult to understand why, unless for contextual reasons, "heart-easing" in "heart-easing Mirth" should be any more allegorical than e.g. "pain-killing" in "pain-killing liniment". And this holds equally good for the other "classes". In other words, the classification depends entirely on contextual instances, and as such is hardly deserving of the name, apart from the fact that the mere allegorical or mythological or rhetorical or any other use of a headword does not of necessity impart a similar character to its attributes. It must be said that the writer himself is not unconscious of this importunate fly in the ointment, but rather than draw the consequences he chooses to sit between two stools, a position which, being uncomfortable, makes him jump from the one on to the other.

In fact, it may be doubted whether from another than a purely grammatical point of view the compound epithet offers any facet for special contemplation, and the question arises whether Mr. Groom's eulogy on this kind of adjective is, in principle, not equally applicable to the simple epithet or any other form of adjunct, or, for that matter, any other part of speech. One exception, of course, should be made. The metrical form, with which poetry is bound up, makes it a convenient, though not an indispensable, device in this department of literature. But this is such a truism that no further words need be wasted on it. Mr. Groom seems to believe in an inherent and pre-eminent capacity of the compound epithet for poetic expression, and he is, of course, fully entitled to do so. This creed, though not always confessed with the same fervour, and, like all

creeds, now and then embarrassed by the falsehood of its prophecies, is, well considered, the alpha and omega of the essay. It is obvious that under these circumstances anything approximating to a more detached or, if this word is under an anathema in matters of art, a more open-minded point of view can hardly be expected, and that, to say the least of it, the border-line between argument and assertion is bound to become very indistinct. The reading of this kind of work may for several reasons be interesting, especially to congenial minds; it is not enlightening, and even the most scrupulous perusal leaves one at the worst a sadder, but never a wiser man. For aught we know one of the less successful rivals of Mr. Groom may have qualified the compound epithets in a lump as "double-barrelled" solecisms, which, springing from a time when the essential fibre of poetry was so completely different to what it has become in the course of centuries, now linger on in literature from sheer inertia, or pullulate in the jargon of chemistry, medicine and kindred sciences, where they feel perfectly at home.

And what to think of John Wesley's words, quoted by Mr. Groom for a different purpose than they are quoted here: "By labour a man may become a tolerable imitator of Spenser, Shakespeare or Milton, and may heap together many pretty compound epithets."!

Groningen.

A. H. BRAND.

Sir William D'avenant, Poet Laureate and Playwright-Manager. By ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT. 488 pp. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1938. 4 dollars.

The average student of English literature does not know much more about Sir William D'avenant than that he was an experimenter in metre and in dramatic forms. And his knowledge of these facts generally does not rest upon his study of the works themselves, but on the tribute paid to him by Dryden, when the latter justified the choice of the *Annus Mirabilis* stanza by referring to the Preface to *Gondibert* and when, with a curious absence of the critical faculty, he felt bound "with all veneration to his memory, to acknowledge what advantage we receive from that excellent groundwork which he laid". (See: *Of Heroic Plays*.)

A study of Prof. Nethercot's biography will prove somewhat disappointing, especially as regards the metrical innovations (if they were innovations). Neither does D'avenant's position as a dramatist become very clear. Though justice is done to his treatment of the "love-and-honour" play, yet more should have been done to assess his place in literature. Generalizing statements, as on page 119, where the writer speaks of "the major role which he was to play in the development of the English theatre", are unwarranted. And when one reads that "the love-

and-honour drama was to infest the stage as a loud and living memorial to the genius of Will D'avenant until long after his body was dust", one is inclined, keeping in view the real facts, to ask: "How long?" And how can one reconcile this statement with the verdict on the last page, where Prof. Nethercot can only call him "a modest pattern of 17th century playwriting"? And even that much is questionable, since only his first comedy *The Witts*, not quite successful except at court, might be considered as a faint foreshadowing of Restoration Comedy. Again, numerous pages are devoted to D'avenant's Masques (platonian and anti-platonian); a wearisome amount of detail makes the reader lose sight of the real value of these entertainments. Certainly, one cannot but admire the zeal and acumen with which an amazing quantity of material has been amassed, from which, however, a more judicious selection should have been made.

As to the musical entertainments, it might be remarked, that the meaning of the word "opera", as used by the author, is not clear. A distinction should have been made between Italian opera (wholly sung) and D'avenant's operatic endeavours, consisting of spoken dialogue with recitatives, interspersed with songs. These were mainly spectacular and that was also what his adaptations of Shakespeare's plays aimed at. We take it that the term "opera" was loosely applied to any dramatic performance with music. This conception would also account for Pepys's reiterated entry "to the opera". And then there would not be any inconsistency in the remark made by Summers (as reported in the footnote on page 305), for which the latter is taken to task by the author. Also it may be asked here whether it is justifiable to say that "D'avenant implanted the word opera for the first time in the English language"; the O.E.D. has 1644 as its earliest date.

The biographical part of the book is exhaustive and exhausting. Many irrelevant details about D'avenant's quarrels with various creditors might profitably have been suppressed. Yet one would not like to miss the chapters about "The Scandals" and "Home and School". No stone has been left unturned to establish the identity of D'avenant's father, but, notwithstanding unflagging assiduity and wide reading, nothing has come to light to substantiate the rumour that Shakespeare should be regarded as such. Interesting is the account of his relations with Queen Henrietta, both at home and in exile. Highly instructive is the story of the first actresses, as well as the chapter on Shakespeare adaptations (only *King Lear* escaped mutilation). They were always on the same principles: the lyrical passages were cut, the dramatic stressed; if he felt so inclined, as in *Macbeth*, some parts were written in the heroic couplet (by no means regular). An account of D'avenant's death and the subsequent fates of his widow and children concludes the book.¹

Rotterdam.

W. A. OVAA.

¹ A slip of the pen on page 142 has removed Madagascar to the west coast of Africa.

Der Deutsche in der englischen Literatur vom Beginn der Romantik bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkrieges. Von FRITZ SCHULTZ. (Studien zur englischen Philologie.) 188 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1939. RM. 7.20.

Dr. Schultz has set himself the task of recording the English view of Germany and the Germans as reflected in English literature, in a very wide sense of the word, between about 1800 and 1914. Such studies have an interest beyond their own immediate scope, and Dr. S.'s book will, in fact, be useful to many students of 19th century English civilization.

To most Englishmen of the Regency and the early Victorian age Germany appeared in a similar light to that in which the generation before 1914 regarded Russia: a vast, backward country of bad roads, old-fashioned towns, and primitive inns inhabited by honest if somewhat boorish people, whose primitive virtues one might respect, but whom one in no way regarded as one's equals. Parallel with this, there was another view, for which the German romanticists were responsible: Germany was also a romantic country, a land of deep forests, mediaeval castles, torture chambers, subterranean passages, in short the natural scene of stories like *Frankenstein*.

In the Victorian age the outlook changes. Unromantic writers like Thackeray poke somewhat cheap fun at German manners in the innumerable petty principalities with their vest-pocket Courts and armies. On the other hand the British intellectuals, under the guidance of Carlyle, discover "deep, patient, pious Germany", "das Land der Dichter und Denker". This was the period when it became the fashion among a school of English historians (whom Dr. S. rather neglects) to idealize everything "Germanic" and to ascribe to "the Teuton tribes, to whom we owe the best part of our blood" practically everything that was considered of any value in English civilization.

Apart from a few whole-hogging Germanophiles like Carlyle, the tone among English writers in this period is usually patronising, even when they write in praise of Germany. It does not enter their heads that Germany might possibly become a rival to England in any other sphere than that of culture. Incidentally, there is sometimes a curious contrast between the public utterances of the English Germanophiles and their privately recorded remarks. Carlyle, as was to be expected, wrote some exceedingly grumbling letters home from his travels in Germany, and Ruskin, who in a letter to the Daily Telegraph called Prussia "one of the finest monarchies and schools of honour yet organized under heaven", told a friend in a letter that "never have I been thrown into such a state of hopeless and depressing disgust as by this journey in Germany". The war of 1870 (to which Dr. S. devotes an interesting section), at first hailed with enthusiasm by the Germanophile intellectuals, was really the turning point. From now on the old idealization yields place to a more realistic and chillier respect, and in the 90's the English actually begin to

fear Germany. The early years of the 20th century saw Lord Rosebery's "efficiency" campaign and the invasion scare, which produced a whole crop of novels and plays (only one of which is mentioned by Dr. S.) in which Germany is cast for the role of invader previously held by France.

In spite of the growing fear of Germany there were, as Dr. S. points out, very few expressions of actual anti-German feeling. Indeed, there were even fewer than Dr. S. makes out. He speaks of "die von Presse und Diplomatie erhobene Schlachtruf Germania esse delenda". The only thing to which this can possibly be applied are the two foolish articles published in the *Saturday Review* under the ægis of the egregious Frank Harris who incidentally became an out-and-out pro-German during the Great War. These articles were much quoted in Germany, both then and later, but they were quite isolated phenomena and certainly not representative of English opinion at the time.

Dr. Schultz's book is a timely warning to all those rash persons who like to generalize about national character. What emerges most clearly from it is the extraordinary speed with which the English conception of the Germans changes, and the frequency with which events give the lie to it. One explanation is no doubt that what is regarded as innate national characteristics is often really the product of a rapidly changing environment; another is that the observers are often simply ill-informed. One of the most amusing examples of the Victorian pronouncements on the German character (not in Dr. S.'s book) is de Quincey's account of how the murderer William orders some German sailors in an East End doss house to put out their light to prevent them from seeing the blood on his clothes: "Had the British party in the room been awake, Mr. Williams would have aroused a mutinous protest against this arrogant mandate. But Germans are generally mild and facile in their tempers".

Dr. Schultz is a patriotic German, but he handles his somewhat explosive material with admirable tact and good nature, though with nothing of the light touch which the subject might invite. His book is objective; the tone is calm, and he does not even show any annoyance when recording the many supercilious and patronizing criticisms of the Victorians. The chief drawback of his book is that it tends too much to be a mere collection of material, and that generalization is kept in the background for the sake of an accumulation of detail which cannot, after all, be complete. He is a little too reluctant to scrap his notes, with the result that he devotes almost as many pages to unknown and uninteresting people as to the greatest writers, and includes characters that throw little light on his subject. Is there e.g. any point in including Browning's Abt Vogler, the Pied Piper of Hamelin, and Sebald in *Pippa Passes*, seeing that Browning obviously never attempted to give any German colour to them and might just as well have called them Dutchmen or Spaniards?

Dr. S. deplores the difficulty of getting hold of the relevant books. This is perhaps the reason why he has not utilized such an important source as *Punch*, and may also account for his description of Mr. H. G.

Wells as "a notorious German-hater". The arrangement of the book is not very practical. Dr. S. divides his material into three chronological sections, and under each of these he groups it under "Novels", "Drama", "Poetry", "Biography and Essays", "Letters", etc. In the result, Browning's *Pippa Passes* and *Abt Vogler* find themselves in two separate sections, while Matthew Arnold's opinions about Germany must be looked for in five or six different places. The fact that there is no index (there ought to be a law against this!) robs his otherwise very useful book of a good deal of its value as a work of reference.

Copenhagen.

C. A. BODELSEN.

A review of Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*, Part V, is unavoidably held over.

Brief Mention

Robert Browning Bibliographie. Von META FÖRSTER und WINFRIED M. ZAPPE. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer. 1939. RM. 4.—.

In their Browning studies the editors felt the necessity of a complete Browning bibliography. As everything published on Browning before 1895 was collected by T. J. Wise in his *Materials*, which are to be found in Nicoll-Wise's *Literary Anecdotes*, the editors restricted themselves to publications after that year. On comparison with bibliographies contained in separate studies on Browning, one misses Corson's *Introduction to the Study of Robert Browning's Poetry* (Boston 1903) and Fotheringham's *Robert Browning* (1898). Virginia Woolf's *Flush* with its delightful sidelights on the Brownings has not been included either.

Browning students may find that the editors would have rendered them an even greater service if they had included publications previous to 1895. — W. G. H.

Bibliography

PERIODICALS

Englische Studien. 72, 3. Aug. 1938. P. Fijn van Draat, Aliens. Influx of French Words into English. — A. E. H. Swaen, Greenery-Yallery. A continuation of An Essay in Blue. — E. Th. Sehrt, Die Weltanschauung James Branch Cabells. — **Id.** 73, 1. Nov. 1938. J. Rosteutscher, Germanischer Schicksalsglaube und angelsächsische Eliengedichtung. — W. Kranz, Shakespeare und die Antike. — H. T. Swedenberg, Fable, action, unity, and supernatural machinery in English epic theory, 1650-1800. — R. Dittes, Zu einigen Lautwandlungen in der südeinglischn Hochsprache der letzten sechzig Jahre. — F. Brie, Bernhard Fehr †. — P. Meissner rev. Teerink, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* — **Id.** 73, 2.

Mai 1939. E. Eckhardt, Die vokalische Dissimilation im Altenglischen. — K. Malone, Becca and Seafola. — Fr. Klaeber, Beowulf 769 und Andreas 1526 ff. — W. Héraucourt, Das Hendiadyoin als Mittel zur Hervorhebung des Werthhaften bei Chaucer. — R. H. Perkinson, "Is this the Promis'd End?" — G. F. Sensabaugh, Ford's tragedy of love-melancholy. — N. Bøgholm, Über die Genesis des *Kubla Khan*. — H. Marchand, Syntaktische Homonymie: das umschreibende "do". — K. Thielke rev. Wijk, *The Orthography and Pronunciation of Henry Machyn*. — H. W. Häusermann rev. Frauchiger, *Der englische Modernismus*. — Id. 73, 3. Okt. 1939. G. Linke, *Standeð* und *stent* und dergleichen in ags. sicher fixierten Hss. — C. G. Loomis, Two miracles in the Chevelere Assigne. — J. Ellinger, Die mit Präpositionen zusammengesetzten Adverbien *here, there, where*. — F. Schubel, Zur neueren englischen Dialektforschung.

Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen. 168, 1/2. Okt. 1935. W. C. Curry, Sacerdotal science in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, I. — Fr. Klaeber rev. Behre, *The Subjunctive in OE Poetry*. — Id. 168, 3/4. Dez. 1935. F. Mezger, Der germanische Kult und die ae. Feminina auf *-ige* und *-estre*. — W. C. Curry, Sacerdotal science in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, II. — Id. 169, 1/2. [Not available.] — Id. 169, 3/4. Juni 1936. M. Born, Alois Brandl. Zu seinem 80. Geburtstag am 21. Juni 1935. — W. Wichgraf, Suso's *Horologium Sapientiae* in England nach Mss. des 15. Jahrhunderts. — E. Castle, Theobalds *Double Falsehood* und *The History of Cardenio* von Fletcher und Shakespeare. — Id. 170, 1/2. Okt. 1936. G. Schleich, Beiträge zur Textkritik von Lord Berners' Froissart-Übersetzung. — J. Speck, Samuel Taylor Coleridge. — Id. 170, 3/4. Dez. 1936. R. Kaiser, René und Harold. — Id. 171, 1/2. März 1937. F. P. Magoun, Zu den ae. Zaubersprüchen. — J. W. Draper, King James and Shakespeare's literary style. — A. Brandl rev. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, and Ekwall, *Studies on English Place-Names*. — Id. 171, 3/4. Juni 1937. F. Mezger, Zur Ineinanderbildung der verschiedenen Wurzeln und Formen im Präsens Indic. des verbum substantivum im Westgermanischen. — A. Brandl, Beowulf-Epos und Aeneis in systematischer Vergleichung. — H. Marcus, Chaucer, der Freund des einfachen Mannes, I. — Id. 172, 1/2. Sept. 1937. H. Marcus, Chaucer, der Freund des einfachen Mannes, II. — O. Löhmann, Die Rahmenerzählung von Morris' *Earthly Paradise*. — Fr. Klaeber rev. Jespersen, *Analytic Syntax*. — F. Fiedler rev. Schubiger, *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English*. — Id. 172, 3/4. Jan. 1938. F. Wölcken, Schottische Prosa der Gegenwart. — Id. 173, 1/2. April 1938. R. Petsch, Die dramatischen Figuren bei Shakespeare, Goethe, Kleist u.a. Dramatikern. — S. J. Herben, Beowulf, Hrothgar and Grendel. — M. K. Mincoff, Zur Altersfrage der Lindisfarner Glosse. — Id. 173, 3/4. Juni 1938. M. Lehnert, Die Anfänge der wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Phonetik in England, I. — Id. 174, 1/2. Okt. 1938. M. Lehnert, Die Anfänge der wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Phonetik in England, II. — G. Rabuse, J. M. Synges Verhältniss zur französischen Literatur und besonders zu Maeterlinck. — Id. 174, 3/4. Dez. 1938. H. Dietz, Kultur und politische Rede in England. — Id. 175, 1/2. März 1939. R. H. Bowers, *The Middle English St. Brendan's Confession*. — A. Niederstenbruch, Die geistige Haltung Richard Rolles. — Id. 175, 3/4. Juni 1939. F. Wölcken, Schottischer Brief. — Id. 176, 1/4. Nov. 1939. K. Wittig, Die Nachkriegsliteratur Irlands. I.: Die Prosa.

Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift. XXIII, 1/2. Jan.-Feb. 1935. H. Nicolai, „Ecstasy“ und „Passion“. — Id. 3/4. März-April 1935. H. Neuhoof, Die Calibangestalt in Shakespeares „Sturm“. — Id. XXIII, 11/12. Nov.-Dez. 1935. G. Buck, Ueber Swinburnes „Atalanta in Calydon“. — Id. XXIV, 1/2. Jan.-Feb. 1936. H. Meyer-Benfey, Das Problem des Hamlet. — Id. XXIV, 3/4. März-April 1936. L. A. Willoughby, Coleridge und Deutschland. — Id. XXIV, 5/6. Mai-Juni 1936. E. Mertner, Rudyard Kipling und die Tiergeschichte. — Id. XXIV, 11/12. Nov.-Dez. 1936. H. Koziol, Die Entstehung der Umschreibung mit *to do*.

Some Puritan Elements in Browning's Poetry

Milsand, the French critic, reviewing Browning's *Paracelsus* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of December 1851 saw in the hero of the poem the embodiment of

cet esprit gibelin et temporel qui au seizième siècle commençait à poindre, et qui préparait le Quaker Fox avec son mépris de toute théorie, la science studieuse avec son mépris des *a priori*, les temps modernes en général avec leur mépris de l'idéalisme que Rome la païenne partageait avec les ascètes chrétiens. C'est l'esprit pratique qui venait enseigner à l'homme à faire le meilleur usage possible de la vie, tandis que l'idéalisme Romain ou Monacal lui avait dit: "Méprise les choses de la terre, fais toi un idéal et offre lui tout en holocauste; fais-toi des principes, et périsses le monde plutôt que les principes!"¹

It was this new spirit, the spirit of Protestant ethics, that, half a century later, Max Weber elucidated and analysed in his *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, and in doing so he stressed the Puritans' ² insistence on the necessity for the believers to lead a methodical life full of effort, a life of labour and industry, which is man's duty towards God. By his unflagging industry in his daily work, by his activities "*ad majorem gloriam Dei*", the true Christian proved that he was among the elect and if he should doubt this, his rigorously disciplined methodical way of living, his aversion to the more pleasant realms of life, his devotion to his trade or profession were certainly means of laying his doubt and anxiety in this respect. Some cases in point may be adduced here. Green's famous chapter on the Puritans in his *Short History of the English People* supplies a few examples. "His (i.e. Colonel Hutchinson's) life was orderly and methodical, sparing of diet and of self-indulgence; he rose early, he never was at any time idle, and hated to see anyone else so." (Everyman edition, p. 434.) "When others recreated themselves at holidays and other times, she (Mrs. Wallington) would take her needle-work and say 'here is my recreation'." (*Ib.*, p. 435). "My father", he (Milton) says, "destined me while yet a little boy to the study of humane letters; which I seized with such eagerness that from the twelfth year of my age I scarcely ever went from my lessons to bed before midnight". (*Ib.*, p. 435.)

¹ Houvelaque, *La Jeunesse de Browning*, Paris, 1933.

² The terms "Puritanism" and "Puritans" are used in this essay to denote the movement, and its professors, for greater strictness of life and simplicity in worship, which grew up in the Church of England in the 16th century among those who thought that there had not been a sufficient divergence from the Roman Church and which ultimately led to the rise of a number of Free Churches (*Encycl. Brit.*). Cp. also Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*: "Puritanism ... straitened to no single sect and represented in the Anglican Church hardly, if at all, less fully than in those which afterwards separated from it, it determined not only conceptions of theology and church government, but political aspirations, business relations, family life and the minutiae of personal behaviour."

When we search Milton's works for examples of this "fides efficax" we find in *Lycidas* his description of Edward King, who "scorned delights and lived laborious days", for which he shall receive his reward in heaven (*Lycidas*, ll. 65-84). And do not we owe his famous sonnet *On His Blindness* to his solicitude about his "one talent which is death to hide, / Lodged with [him] useless"? Turning to *Paradise Lost* we hear the archangel Michael urging Adam to "add deeds to his knowledge answerable" when he will have left Paradise (bk. 12, ll. 578-587). The whole final passage of *Paradise Lost* is an expression of Adam's eagerness to begin a life of activity in *this* world³. In *A History of Modern Culture*, chapter 12, Religion, Professor G. Lincoln Burr says of Milton's *Paradise Regained*: "If *Paradise Lost* is the epic of Puritan Doctrine, *Paradise Regained* is the epic of Puritan Ethics. It is notable that Milton selects, in his scheme of man's redemption, not the death on the cross, but the scene of Christ's temptation in the wilderness. In Milton's Christ the Calvinist ideal of vocation, of doing resolutely the work for which one is appointed, is incarnated. Jesus is tempted with pleasure, love, learning, wealth, and fame, and puts them all aside, so that he may follow resolutely the mission for which he is sent. Thus it is that the devil is foiled by him, and through him by all the elect and faithful ones". — Milton makes Christ say in *Paradise Regained*, bk. 1, ll. 200-204:

When I was yet a child, no childish play
To me was pleasing; all my mind was set
Serious to learn and know, and thence to do
What might be public good.

In line 233, Mary urges her Son: "By matchless *deeds* express thy matchless Sire".

In book 2, Solomon is mentioned, who

lived at ease, and full
Of honour, wealth, high fare, aimed not beyond
Higher design than to enjoy his state;
Thence to the bait of women lay exposed.

and is contrasted with Christ:

But he whom we attempt is wiser far
Than Solomon, of more exalted mind,
Made and set wholly on the accomplishment
Of greatest things:

(bk. 2, 201-208.)

Bunyan, in his allegories, sees a Christian's life as a difficult journey with many obstacles and dangers to be surmounted (*Pilgrim's Progress*) or as a prolonged fight with evil (*The Holy War*). He repeatedly condemns the sin of sloth and we find such sentences as: "He that sleeps

³ Cp. Max Weber, *Die Protestantische Ethik*.

is a loser; Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise." (*Pilgr. Progr.*) Christian says: "Oh, wretched man that I am, that I should sleep in the day-time, that I should sleep in the midst of difficulty." (*Pilgr. Progr.*) Faithful says he is deceived in Talkative of Prating Row and Christian exhorts him to remember the proverb: "They say and do not", and: "The Kingdom of God is not in Word but in Power". And further: "At the day of doom men shall be judged according to their fruits. It will not be said then, Did you believe?, but were you *Doers* or *Talkers* only? and accordingly shall they be judged." (*Pilgr. Progr.*) — Also: "Yea, if a man have all knowledge, he may yet be nothing and so consequently be no child of God. When Christ said: Do you know all these things? and the disciples had answered: Yes, he addeth: Blessed are ye if ye *do* them." (*Pilgr. Progr.*) When Christian and Hopeful come to the plain, called Ease, Bunyan says: "that plain was but narrow", adding: "the ease that pilgrims have is but little in this life". — Christian exhorts Hopeful: "Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be sober." In the second part of *A Pilgrim's Progress* Bunyan writes, in his introductory rhyme, about Mercy:

Come see her in her virgin face and learn
'twixt *idle* ones and Pilgrims to discern.

Although in *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* by William Law (1686-1761), who according to Cazamian (*History of English Literature*) forms the connecting link between the vast Puritan movement in the seventeenth century and the Methodist Revival of the eighteenth, we find more stress laid on piety and humility and the mystic union with God than in Milton or Bunyan, this work breathes the same spirit of strenuous endeavour. On page 3 (S.P.C.K. edition) Law condemns unreasonable and absurd ways of living, whether in labour or diversion, whether they consume our time or our money, as being like unreasonable and absurd prayers. The salvation of our souls is set forth in Scripture as a thing of difficulty that requires all our diligence, that is to be worked out with fear and trembling (p. 24). The Lord commands us to strive to enter in, religion is a state of labour and striving (p. 25). Our salvation depends upon the sincerity and perfection of our endeavours to obtain it (p. 26). On page 28 he quotes St. Paul writing to the Philippians (*Phil.* 3, 12-14): "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before. I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

Law strongly emphasises the necessity of rules (method) in religious and worldly matters (ch. 6 and 17). On page 76 sloth and idleness are condemned; he urges people to rise early, so that they may praise God ("don't be a slothful drone, wasting your time in bed"). On page 52 we

find him urging his readers to follow the truth through all dangers and against all opposition.

Law reminds us of Bunyan's "Are you Doers or Talkers only" when he says that making all our actions so many steps towards a better life, is offering a better sacrifice to God than any forms of holy and heavenly prayers (p. 122). He sets great store by the parable of the talents ("working with our talents is the will of God"). The *Serious Call* ends with the words: "Would we therefore exercise a true fortitude, we must do all in the spirit of devotion, be valiant against the corruptions of the world and the lusts of the flesh and the temptations of the devil; for to be daring and courageous against these enemies, is the noblest bravery that a human mind is capable of."

Reading these examples of and admonitions to strenuous endeavour, we understand that they cannot spring from an attitude of half-heartedness and laxity. There must be an intensity and will-power behind them to which Tawney in *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* draws attention. He says: "For it is will — will organised and disciplined and inspired, will quiescent in rapt adoration or straining in violent energy, but always will — which is the essence of Puritanism, and for the intensification and organisation of will every instrument in that tremendous arsenal of religious fervour is mobilised. The Puritan is like a steel spring compressed by an inner force, which shatters every obstacle by its rebound. Sometimes the strain is too tense, and when its imprisoned energy is released, it shatters itself."

While the ideas of method and system already played an important part in Puritan ethics, the 18th century Wesleyan movement took its name from the notion of method. It insisted on a methodical way of living, on method in the fulfilment of the religious duties, in order to obtain the certainty of salvation, while emotional elements (conversion) were of almost equal importance.

We may see Methodism as a combination of emotional elements and the rational, ascetic, Puritan views, from which the notions of unflagging industry and sustained effort evolved.

The two great leaders of Methodism, John Wesley and George Whitefield may be said to represent the two components. Wesley stresses the importance of *feeling* the certainty of being saved and wants to extend the divine grace to all human beings, whereas Whitefield represents the Predestination doctrine of the older sects.

Wesley also taught that the converted might even in this life attain to a higher state, which was called by him the state of entire sanctification. The converted might attain to this state by their sustained attempts at conquering their doubts and through God's mercy working in them. It might be hard to reach this sanctification, but one should always be active in the pursuit of it. W. B. Pope, the Wesleyan divine, in his *Peculiarities of Methodist Doctrine* says: "The answer to the question how this state of entire sanctification is to be reconciled with man's imperfection is by remembering that it is the perfection of the redeemed amidst all the

limitations of sense and infirmity and that there is a future of unlimited progress."⁴

A trait which we find both in Puritan authors and in a poet greatly indebted to the Methodist movement, William Cowper, is the note of despair and self-accusation. We have Bunyan's well-known exaggerated descriptions of his youthful misdemeanours, and Green quotes Cromwell writing to a friend: "Oh, I lived in and loved darkness and hated light. I hated godliness."⁵ Cowper's: "I was a stricken deer that left the herd", strikes the same note. Also his

When such a destined wretch as I,
Washed headlong from on board

(*The Castaway.*)

and

But me, scarce hoping to attain that rest,
Always from port withheld, always distressed, ...

(*On the receipt of my mother's picture out of Norfolk.*)

The Methodist revival, which was a movement within the Church of England, came to have a great influence on the official religion of the Anglican Church. It created within the bosom of the Church the powerful party of the Evangelicals, who formed a strong contrast with what has been called the "high and dry" church of the latter part of the 18th century and the early years of the 19th, in which the true service of God had sunk to a very low level⁶.

*

Let us now consider in how far Browning may be said to reflect the Puritan and Methodist doctrines. For although, especially in his later poems dealing with religious and philosophical problems, Browning shows himself influenced by 19th century modernism, with its distrust of dogma and its individualism in religious thought, the above-mentioned traits of Puritanism and Methodism played an important part in his philosophy. Before we turn to his poems we may consider the influences that went to the shaping of his religious views.

Sharp, in his *Life of Browning*, referring to the poet's ancestors, says that Browning described himself as a good Protestant who sprang of a Puritan stock; he was tolerant of all religious forms, but with a natural bias towards Anglican Evangelicalism. Browning's father reminds us of the great Evangelical leader, Wilberforce, and his struggle for the abolition of the slave trade and slavery, in that he gave up a career in the colonies

⁴ See Loofs' article in *Realencycl. für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. W. B. Pope wrote this in 1903. Loofs adds, however: "Dass diese modernen Ausführungen nicht im Sinne J. Wesleys seien, wird man kaum behaupten dürfen."

⁵ Green adds: "The absolute devotion of the Puritan to a Supreme Will tended more and more to rob him of all sense of measure and proportion in common matters."

⁶ Somervell, *History of Engl. Thought in the 19th Cent.*

and accepted a minor post in the Bank of England because, as Browning said, "he could not bear with slavery". Browning's mother was a deeply religious woman, belonging to the sect of the Congregationalists, in which the older Puritan ideas were still very much alive. The poet loved her with an admiring love and it may be assumed that she was an important influence in her son's religious life.⁷

Turning to Browning's works we find that the "fides efficax", which was a characteristic of all the Puritan sects, the idea that "it is action that God is most served and honoured by" (Baxter) is a tenet which occurs again and again in his poems, and, although we can trace a development and growth in other directions, this doctrine manifested itself in all periods of his career. *Paracelsus* (1835), not satisfied with the quiet life in Würzburg with Festus and Michal, "shut in so well from all rude chances", leaves them to fulfil "God's great commission" to work with his talents, "prepared to task to the uttermost his strength" and to give his answer to the will of God, who "summons him to be his organ". In reply to his friends' urgent requests to stay he says: "Be sure they sleep not whom God needs." When he returns to his friend Festus, a failure in the eyes of the world, he knows that he has attained; he has learned God's message to mankind, that "progress is the law of life".

A *Grammarians' Funeral* (1855) describes one of those great men who "left play for work, and grappled with the world bent on escaping", who know no relaxation:

"Now, master, take a little rest!" — not he!

— — — — —
Back to his studies, fresher than at first,

Fierce as a dragon

He (soul-hydroptic with a sacred thirst)

Sucked at the flagon.

— — — — —
He ventured neck or nothing — heaven's success

Found, or earth's failure.

The Statue and the Bust (1855) is a condemnation of sloth and inactivity and procrastination on the part of the protagonists, which led to their souls' undoing:

Only they see not God, I know,

Nor all that chivalry of his,

The soldier-saints who, row on row,

Burn upward each to his point of bliss —

Since the end of life being manifest,

He had burned his way thro' the world to this.

⁷ It would seem one of life's ironies that it was his mother who procured him Shelley's "atheistic" poems, which were to cause the religious doubts referred to in *Pauline*. Houvelaque, in his *La Jeunesse de Browning*, shows that afterwards Browning came to a better understanding of Shelley (*Essay on Shelley*).

Their sin was "the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin", symbols of fecklessness and frustration. — Nine years later Browning treated the same subject, though in a somewhat lighter tone, in *Youth and Art* (1864). The singer feels that she and the painter have not fulfilled God's great commission, because, when their chance came, they missed it, they were inactive and kept putting off things.

Prospice (1864), where Browning says of himself: "I was ever a fighter, so — one fight more", reminds us of Bunyan's Christian passing through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. — In *The Ring and the Book* the Pope, who may be seen as Browning himself passing judgment, praises Caponsacchi, the Roman priest, who acts and makes himself useful in this world and thus becomes one of Browning's soldier-saints.

More examples might be given, but suffice it to quote the last poem Browning wrote, the "Epilogue" to *Asolando*:

What had I on earth to do
With the slothful, with the mawkish, the unmanly?
Like the aimless⁸, helpless, hopeless, did I drivel
— Being — who?

One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

No, at noonday in the bustle of man's work-time
Greet the unseen with a cheer!
Bid him forward breast and back as either should be,
"Strive and thrive!" cry "Speed, — fight on, fare ever
There as here!"

There is also a striking resemblance between William Law's insistence on the importance of the striving to enter in, the sincerity and perfection of our endeavours (see p. 35 and his quotation from St. Paul's epistle to the Philippians), and Browning's message that more important than reaching the goal are our attempts to reach it, no matter whether these attempts are crowned with success:

Why is it I dare
Think but lightly of such impuissance? What stops my despair?
This: — 'tis not what man Does which exalts him, but what man Would do!
See the King — I would help him but cannot, the wishes fall through.
(*Saul*; 1845.)

What I aspired to be,
And was not, comforts me. (Rabbi Ben Ezra; 1864.)

Life is probation and the earth no goal,
But starting-point of man, compel him strive,
Which means in man, as good as reach the goal.
(*The Ring and the Book*; *The Pope*; 1869.)

⁸ Cp. the Puritan and Methodist idea of system and method.

One might also draw a comparison between the Methodist doctrine of entire sanctification which to the converted holds out a state of bliss to be attained by moral effort and through God's mercy working in man, and Browning's doctrine of strenuous endeavour to reach a state of perfection, which is bound up with his notion of progress. Both Wesley and Browning point to a higher state to which man's efforts should be directed. The difference is that, while Wesley taught that this state might be reached in this life, Browning believed that the growth to perfection is not restricted to our life here on earth, but continues after we have "crossed the bar":

Leave now to dogs and apes, man has forever.

(*A Grammarian's Funeral.*)

Both believe in progress:

... the law of life, man is not Man as yet.

(*Paracelsus.*)

... Man's distinctive mark alone.

Not God's and not the beasts'. God is, they are,

Man partly is and wholly hopes to be. (*A Death in the Desert.*)

The note of despair and self-accusation mentioned in connection with Bunyan, Cromwell, and Cowper is also struck by the young Browning in his *Pauline*:

... Smiling like a fiend who has deceived God,

I felt a strange delight in causing my decay,

I was a fiend in darkness chained forever

Within some ocean cave.

and, speaking of Shelley:

I have nought in common with him,

Shapes which followed him, avoid me and foul forms

Seek me, which ne'er could fasten on his mind.

Why have I girt myself with this hell-dress?

Why have I laboured to put out my life?

In *Pauline* Browning says of himself: "I am made up of an intensest life", and in this reminds us of the intensity of the Puritan's life mentioned by Tawney in his *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (see above). When we consider Browning's work as a whole, we find there the same intensity, the same energetic attitude towards life and its problems. This intensity and energy also comes out in the choice and treatment of his subject-matter. It may also offer an explanation why Browning's poems are thought obscure by many people. It is as if his accumulated energy bursting into form makes him become incoherent at times⁹. Swinburne seems to be quite right when he says:

⁹ It is this same intensity which often causes the form admirably to take body from the sense, cp. the beginning of *Pippa Passes* with the shout "Day"; the opening of *The Confessional* and such poems as *Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister*, *How they brought the good news from Ghent to Aix*, *Holy-Cross Day* and others.

The difficulty found by many in certain of Mr. Browning's works arises from a quality the very reverse of that which produces obscurity properly so called. Obscurity is the natural product of turbid forces and confused ideas, of a feeble and clouded, of a vigorous, but unfused and chaotic intellect Now if there is any great quality more perceptible than any others in Mr. Browning's intellect, it is his decisive and incisive faculty of thought, his sureness and intensity of perception, his rapid and trenchant resolution of aim He never thinks but at full speed, and the rate of his thought is to that of another man's as the speed of a railway to that of a waggon or the speed of a telegraph to that of a railway.

(Houvelaque quoting Swinburne in his *La Jeunesse de Browning*.)¹⁰

Goes.

W. G. HARTSTRA.

Notes and News

Elckerlijc — Everyman. Soon after the appearance of our article in the February number we had our attention drawn to one or two publications on the subject that had escaped us. A brief summary of their contents may be of interest.

In the *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* (*Revue d'Histoire du Droit*) XVII, 3 (recently published), Dr. D. Th. Enklaar points out that in the Dutch text (665-671) *Elckerlijc* makes his testament according to canon law (*deel ic den armen van mijnen goede / Deen helft ende dander helft daer nae / Gheuick daer si schuldich is te gaen*), whereas in the English text (696-702), where *Everyman* says *And the other halfe styll shall remane / In quyet to be returned there it ought to be*, customary law ('*terugvalsrecht*', '*droit de retour*') is mixed up with canon law. In this legal confusion he sees a collateral argument for the derivative character of the English text.

In a note Dr. Enklaar conveys the startling news that Dr. K. H. de Raaf, the protagonist of the priority of *Everyman*, publicly recanted his opinion in a review in the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, October 12, 1934 (Avondblad E2). On turning to the number in question, it appeared that Dr. de Raaf confessed to having been converted to the opposite view by the articles of Manly and Wood referred to on p. 2 of the February number. A letter from Dr. de Raaf himself confirmed the testimony of the newspaper;

¹⁰ Although it would seem strange to use the term "Puritan" for Browning's conception of the poet's task, yet it is poles apart from art for art's sake. In *Sordello* Browning says: the greatest poet is not "the Seer" but "the Maker-See", who imparts the gift of seeing to the rest. In *Fra Lippo Lippi* we find a similar task allotted to the painters: to make man better understand beauty by showing it in painting. "For don't you mark? we're made so that we love first, when we see them painted, Things we have passed perhaps a hundred times, nor cared to see". Also Browning's statement in a letter to Wm. Kingsland that he "never pretended to offer such literature as should be a substitute for a cigar or a game of dominoes to an idle man" points in the same direction.

so that, with the principal champion of *Everyman* gone over to the other camp, the priority of the English text is now left practically without a single supporter.

Another contribution to the subject that had escaped our attention is contained in an article by Mr. E. R. Tigg, of Birkbeck College, University of London, entitled: "Is *Elckerlijc* prior to *Everyman*?" and published in the (American) *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXXVIII, 4, Oct. 1939.¹ Mr. Tigg could hardly have known of Dr. de Raaf's change of mind; in spite, however, of his avowed intention "to examine selected arguments of all my predecessors", he appears to be also ignorant of the important articles of Manly and Wood. Nor can it be admitted, on the sole strength of a quotation from the relevant passage in the CHEL (written by Professor Creizenach of the University of Cracow!), that "the generally accepted view in England is that the Dutch work is a translation of the English." Pollard's unqualified recognition of the priority of *Elckerlijc* was quoted in our article; J. S. Farmer, in his edition of *Everyman* in the Museum Dramatists (London, 1906) writes of "*Everyman*, which indeed is a translation of the Dutch *Elckerlijc*"; the *Oxford Companion to English Literature* has: "*Everyman*, the title of a popular morality of the 15th cent., of Dutch origin." It would seem, therefore, that Mr. Tigg's statement on this head is, to say the least of it, too sweeping.

Apart from this, Mr. Tigg's article contains an argument for the priority of *Elckerlijc* which is as ingenious as it is convincing. On comparing, for instance, *Everyman* 721-2:

Here in this transytory *lyfe* / for the and me
The blesseyd sacramentes *seuen* there be

with *Elckerlijc* 690-1:

Hier in desen aertschen *leuen*
Die heylighe sacramenten *seuen*

it struck him that, if the Dutchman had been the translator, he would have found his end-rhymes ready-made for him by simply ruling through the last words of the English couplet — a supposition too unlikely to be acceptable. If, however, we assume that it was rather the Englishman who worked from the Dutch text, and who added the tags to make a new rhyme, we have a plausible explanation.

To show that this is not an isolated phenomenon we will reproduce the other cases cited by Mr. Tigg:²

¹ It has since reappeared in the current (January) number of *Neophilologus* (publ. Febr. 8).

² The text is Logeman's, which is rather inaccurately reproduced by Mr. Tigg, who follows Endepols in his Dutch quotations.

El. 732-3

Ende som sitten si bi *wiuēn*
In onsuerheyte van *liuen*

El. 212-3

Ick gae met v al waert in die *helle*
Ghi spreect als een [goet³] *gheselle*

Here, as Mr. Tigg observes, one ruling would have sufficed to reveal a rhyme with the English rhyming word. Another example:

El. 270-3

Mer haddi ter werelt noch *ghebleuen*
Ick en hadde v nemmermeer *begheuen*
Nu moet v ons lieue here *gheleyden*
Ick wil van v *scheyden*

"To believe that four consecutive lines would offer such convenient rhymes for a translator is preposterous."

Mr. Tigg has one more example, the force of which, however, we fail to see:

El. 746-7

..... danc heb diet *riet*
Nv vrienden sonder te letten *yet*

Ev. 761-2

And some haunteth *womens* company
With vnclene *lyfe* as lustes of lechery

Ev. 232-4

For in fayth and thou go to *hell*
I wyll not forsake the by the waye
Ye speke lyke a good *frende* / I beleue
you well

Ev. 294-6

But and ^u*y* had *taryed* I wolde not a *left*
the so
And as now god *spede* the in thy iourney
For from the I wyll *departe* as fast as I may

Ev. 746-7

Blessyd be all they that *counceyled* me to
take it
And now *frendes* let us go without
longer respyte

What meaning does he attach to the Dutch word *yet*?

For the rest of Mr. Tigg's arguments we must refer to his article.

It remains to say that Dr. Endepols has recently published a modernized text of *Elckerlijc*, with an introduction, in *Vijf Geestelijke Toneelspelen der Middeleeuwen* (Bibliotheek der Nederlandse Letteren, 1940), as well as a fourth impression of his old-spelling edition referred to in our article; and that Professor J. van Mierlo, in Volume II of the *Geschiedenis van de Letterkunde der Nederlanden* (1940), tries to revive the claim of Petrus Dorlandus to the authorship of *Elckerlijc*. An abstract of a lecture on *Elckerlijc* by Mr. L. C. Michels was published in *Handelingen van het Veertiende Nederlandsche Philologen-Congres*, 1931. Lastly, the reader is requested to correct a few slight errors in our article in the February number: p. 3, l. 28, *Ev.* 29, read *El.* 29; p. 4, l. 25, *harte*, read *herte*; p. 6, l. 16, 850, read 856; p. 9, l. 17, *Rooyaards'*, read *Royaards'*. — Z.

³ The reading of the H text.

Reviews

A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. By OTTO JESPERSEN. Part V. Syntax. Fourth Volume. xv + 528 pp. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard. 1940. Dan. Cr. 20.—.

To publish a volume of more than five hundred pages at the age of eighty, as a sequel to a work the first part of which appeared thirty-one years ago, is an achievement worthy of the greatest respect. Though even now *A Modern English Grammar* is incomplete — another volume, on Morphology, is still to come — taken together with his numerous other publications it establishes Jespersen's position as the foremost representative of the study of the English language. To say this is not to detract from the merits of others whose contributions to the subject are no less valuable, but who, from preference or necessity, have confined their published researches within narrower bounds.

It is probably needless to recall that Part I of *A Modern English Grammar* (1909) dealt with the history of English sounds and spellings; Part II (Syntax. First Volume, 1914) with substantives, adjectives and pronouns; Part III (Syntax. Second Volume, 1927) with relative clauses, subjects, objects and predicatives; Part IV (Syntax. Third Volume, 1931) with time and tense. The main subject-matter of the present volume is what Jespersen terms the 'dependent nexus': a simple nexus as object; a simple nexus as regimen of a preposition; a simple nexus as tertiary; nexus-substantives; the gerund; the infinitive; clauses; an implied nexus (agent-substantives and participles).

Those unfamiliar with Jespersen's terminology will do well to read Dr. Mulder's review of his *Essentials of English Grammar* (1933, 4th impression 1938) in *E. S.*, April 1940. Suffice it to repeat here that by junction is meant "a combination of words which do not denote predication", like a *furiously barking dog*, where we distinguish a tertiary (*furiously*), a secondary (*barking*) and a primary (*dog*) — Jespersen's distinction of ranks; while "a combination implying predication" constitutes nexus: *the dog barks furiously*. Sentences like "They judged me a happy man", "no chance of the lady coming back", "I'll make him talk", contain examples of dependent nexus.

In this volume Jespersen has also made use of the system of syntactical symbols explained in his *Analytical Syntax* (1937). That a sentence like *The cat killed the mouse* can be symbolized by S V O (Subject — Verb — Object) will be almost self-evident, nor is v S V O? for *Did the cat kill the mouse?* (v standing for a 'lesser verb'), or s V P S(I) for *It is dreadful to suffer* difficult to grasp, once it is understood that s stands for 'lesser subject', I for infinitive, and that round brackets serve to explain the item immediately preceding. A formula like S(O*) Vⁿ P(2pl*) for *The pear is not fit to eat* looks more forbidding and requires more elucidation than we can give it here, though it is mere child's play as compared with, say,

S VⁿO 3(S₂P(YP₂(P^cS₂V))) for *You cannot expect more, prices being what they are.* Jespersen believes that a close study of his formulas will give a deeper insight into grammatical constructions in general, and states that the elaboration of the system "has opened [his] eyes to the real character of many things even in the languages [he] was most familiar with." It may be well to add, however, for those who boggle at this linguistic algebra, that its acquisition is no *condicio sine qua non* for the understanding and appreciation of the book under review.

It seems reasonable to apply the severest test to a work like the present, and to ask: what benefit does a reader familiar with the treatment of gerund, participle, infinitive etc. by other leading grammarians derive from Jespersen's discussion of these subjects? The answer is, first: the benefit that always accrues from seeing well-known facts arranged and commented on from a fresh point of view. This aspect of the Danish scholar's work should specially recommend it in a country like Holland, with a strong tradition of its own in the study of English syntax, a tradition none the less abiding for the radical twist given it in the last decade. Careful consideration of Jespersen's analyses and classifications cannot fail to prove salutary to radical and conservative alike.

Another notable feature of *A Modern English Grammar* is the astounding wealth of illustrative materials poured out over its pages as from a linguistic cornucopia. It is improbable that even the most widely-read specialist in modern English syntax should not discover among its hundreds upon hundreds of quotations, arranged with marvellous clarity as well as economy of space, interesting cases that had hitherto escaped his attention. The mere perusal, chapter by chapter, of these well authenticated examples will fill gaps in any reader's knowledge.

All this does not, of course, mean that our attitude to Jespersen's work should be one of uncritical admiration. Like all human achievements, it has the defects of its qualities. For one thing, the author's passion for logical classification sometimes obtrudes itself between the reader and the language analysed. It is not, perhaps, insignificant that Volume V opens with the words: "My grammatical system ...": — one cannot always get away from the impression that the grammatical system is even more important than the phenomena of English syntax.¹ Jespersen's *Grammar*, more than most other books of the same type, strikes one as an ingeniously contrived cabinet of enormous capacity, with the author sorting out cart-loads of quotations each into its appropriate pigeon-hole. The comparison is suggested by a remark by the author himself on p. 151 of the present volume: "The uses of English infinitives are so manifold, and there is so much overlapping among them, that I have experienced considerable difficulty in classifying them and in fitting each quotation and example into the appropriate pigeonhole." Add to this the divisions of the cabinet according to the categories of nexus and junction, with the sub-categories

¹ "The principle on which my system is based is this." (21.16, on "Clauses as Tertiaries").

of primaries, secondaries etc., and the, to the uninitiated, almost cabalistic symbols from *Analytical Syntax* over the pigeon-holes, and we find ourselves in the presence of a grammatical system, ingenious indeed, but almost top-heavy with over-elaboration. *Simplex sigillum veri*.

Another weak spot — in this reviewer's opinion, at least — in Jespersen's work is that the 'metaphysic' on which it is based was already obsolescent in the linguistic centres of Europe when the first part of the *Syntax* appeared, and has since become all but obsolete. To put the matter plainly: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* is a contradiction in terms. One cannot in the same book describe the state of a language at a given moment together with the processes, different for each phenomenon, by which it passed from earlier phases to the stage described. Jespersen's attempt to do so has not infrequently resulted in fragmentariness and blurring of outlines. Though his work contains a great deal of information on the history of English syntax as well as on the syntactic system of present-day English, it is not wholly satisfactory from either point of view: it gives both too much and too little. Nor does the author always take sufficient care to keep the various chronological strata apart. Thus in 7.51 it is not pointed out that a construction like *in order to their deliverance*, in spite of quotations from McCarthy and Ruskin, is now unusual (the omission being in this case repaired in 16.44 ["formerly frequent"]); nothing is said of the obsolete character of a sentence like Walton's "I have had from some chymical man an affirmation of them to be very advantageous" (7.62); there is no indication that *had best* is now far less usual than *had better* (similar omission in Part IV, 9.42); the only quotation to show that "*will after if* always denotes volition" (21.64) is from the Authorized Version. That Jespersen is not in the habit of sharply differentiating between the present and the older stages of the language also appears in his calling *deceit* and *thought* substantives formed with the derivative ending *-t* (V, 7.11); in his analysing a word like *Sunday* as a compound of 'the ordinary type', symbolizing it in the same way as a word like *bedroom* and a group like *Westminster Abbey* (*Analytical Syntax*, p. 26); or in his treating *holiday* as a 'compound of adjective and substantive' (*ib.* p. 18); — "a view" — to quote his own words on p. 60 of the same book — "which is historically (diachronically) impeccable, but which shows perhaps nothing as to the present (synchronic) feeling which it is our task to investigate and denote in our symbols."

We hope we shall not be blamed for destructive criticism — a work like this would take a great deal of destroying — if we formulate one more objection to Jespersen's treatment of grammar. It is that the grammarians, the scholarly ones as well as the Mrs. Grundys of English grammar, are never long absent from his thoughts, a peculiarity that gives to his books, and indeed to his own way of thinking, a curiously scholastic turn. In other words: Jespersen is not only preoccupied with his own grammatical system, but with those of other grammarians as well, registering and on occasion refuting their views as if they had an independent value beside

the syntactic structure of the language under investigation. "In *two years ago*, *long ago*, some grammarians may be inclined to consider *ago* as a preposition placed after its regimen" (6.83). "After the definite article the *of*-construction has always been frequent; since the beginning of the 19th c. it has been the construction required by native grammarians" (8.43). "Through what purists may consider an inexact construction the understood subject is not the grammatical subject of the sentence but the natural agent of the action concerned" (9.88). "The question how to analyze combinations like 'on Miss Sharp appearing' has been variously answered. Most grammars, at any rate school grammars, take *appearing* as the (present) participle, ..." (9.91). "But this analysis will not be recognized by all grammarians" (13.62). Just as Jespersen frequently mixes up synchrony and diachrony, so he often fails to keep apart normative and descriptive grammar, a tendency betraying itself even in his anxiety to remind British and American readers that "it is not [his] business to tell them what is correct or pure English, but only to register and, if possible, to explain the actual facts of English usage in various periods" (Preface to *MEG*, Vol. III). The truth is that there is a good deal of the old grammatical leaven in Jespersen himself, and that his work is not nearly so revolutionary as he makes out. One's 'philosophy of grammar' will not pass for 'modern' on the strength of, say, a refusal to distinguish a dative from an accusative in present-day English, so long as one adheres to formulations such as: "These constructions ... serve in some measure to avoid a passive infinitive (*has the book bound* = *has the book be bound*, ...)" (3.62); or: "Perfectly unnatural, from the present point of view, are constructions with the second participle like the following:" (6.42); or: "The subject of the gerund is naturally expressed by the genitive case or a possessive pronoun, just as in the case of any other nexus substantive" (8.51); or: "The following examples seem more inexcusable" (9.89); or again (12.11): "An infinitive may be the object after (1) a great many verbs: I can sing | I want to sing, ... Historically 'He can sing' means 'He knows singing' "

*

If any student of English syntax were to think that the above objections absolve him from the duty of studying *A Modern English Grammar* with the greatest care, we should hasten to assure him that such an inference would be entirely fallacious. Nor do we wish to finish this review on a merely critical note. A discussion of a few special points from the present volume will provide an opportunity to bring out the rich variety of its contents as well as to offer a few more examples for the author's consideration.

In 2.75 it is recalled that the perfect has developed from such a construction as *he has the fish caught* (i.e. as caught), whence later *he has caught the fish*. It is also pointed out that the original construction is still frequent with verbs meaning 'beat, surpass': "If it comes to literature you defeat

me — you have me beat at once." Other examples are given with *trapped*, *snaffled*, *cornered* and *scared*; we ourselves have noted specimens with *surrounded* (Marshall Chiang Kai-shek, with 1,200,000 well-armed soldiers, had him virtually surrounded. N. Y. Times Magazine, Jan. 3, 1937, p. 4), *spotted*, *baffled*, *balled up*, *stumped*, *buffaloed*, *puzzled*, all of them from American sources. The following quotations show, however, that there was no need to limit the construction to participles meaning something like 'beaten':

And at the back of his mind Antony has this *registered* clearly enough.
Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, I, 71.

The operation may be expensive, and I have no money *saved*.
Robert Clive, *Mud and Stars*, p. 40.

Indeed, the descriptive quality of the participle is often intensified by separating it from the auxiliary, as in 'I have my paper all *written*.'
Kennedy, *Current English*, p. 523.

But, nevertheless, the duke had a revolt well *planned* for the coming Fourth of July celebration.
James Stevens, *Paul Bunyan*, p. 161.

You still have my review of ... *unpublished*, I believe.
Letter from American correspondent.

... and the statue of William Penn high up above. I had that statue *mixed up* in my mind with God, ...
Chr. Morley, *Kitty Foyle*, p. 10.

They had it all *worked out* in their minds before I got there.
Ib., p. 53.

Nor is the construction limited to participles. The following examples belong to the semantic sphere of 'beaten'; Jespersen's examples in 3.61 are all, rather curiously, of the other variety:

The Invisible Man had him *down* grimly, but his arms were free, and he struck and tried to kick savagely.
H. G. Wells, *The Invisible Man*, ch. XVI.

He had Rome completely *at his mercy* ...
Farnham, *Medieval Inheritance*, p. 98.

Titivillus soon has Mankind so *infirm* of purpose that he is ready to go to a tavern ...
Ib., p. 198.

Marcellus is of a finer temper, and the whole mysterious business has him the more sharply *on edge*.
Granville-Barker, *Hamlet*, p. 245.

In connection with 3.5 (to get with an object and past participle) the following quotations are interesting as showing a transition to the meaning of *have* with the American participles mentioned above:

"Don't you get my father *excited*," I warned him. "I'm the quietest fellow in the world," he says, "I never get anyone *excited*."
Chr. Morley, *Kitty Foyle*, p. 34.

I made a list of the various things that get me *jittered*.
Ib., p. 43.

(The first example of 3.62, on *have* expressing causation, must have been placed here by mistake: Chaucer. G 133, She ... Had next hir flesh y-clad hir in an heyre.)

In 18.71 some more examples are given of the construction *look at him go*, *listen to him talk*, a pattern which this journal may claim to have first brought to light, as is acknowledged by Jespersen.² Even though he is able to adduce some fresh quotations from British sources, we still believe that the construction is more frequent in American English.³ Our impression is also that it occurs more often after *listen to* than after *look at*; at least we have noted seventeen examples (in addition to those formerly published in *E. S.*) of the former as against only six of the latter. In the case of *listen to* the construction seems to be most frequent with the form in *ing* (*listening to him talk*, nine examples) and with the imperative (three). We have two examples with *listen* in the past tense, one in the third person singular present tense, and one in the infinitive:

Because I know that clocks must tick
 Our lives to dust some day,
 I will wind up the music box
 And listen to it play.

Rachel Field, *Fear is the Thorn*.
 (Reviewed and quoted New York Times Book
 Review, March 22, 1936, p. 24.)

Our examples of *look at* are all in the imperative, four of them heard in American sporting films in 1935 and 1939: *Look at him go!* — *Look at him dig in!* (viz. into bank.) — *Look at those boys speed!* (These three from comments on motor-boat race.) — *Look at that horse take it!* The two others are from written sources:

"Look at her git over the ground," said David, turning to watch her while John got into the buggy.
 Westcott, *David Harum* (1898), p. 290.

"There goes the brave little girl of Nr. 22," Rocky announced, "little Gloria Beatty. What a brave kid she is! She's soloing while her partner is in the pit with a charley horse — look at her burn up that track! Give her the inside, kids —"
 McCoy, *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* p. 93.

The social status of *listen to* seems, on the whole, to be superior to that of *look at*, the latter being, on the evidence available, mainly confined to sporting circles.

² See Volume VII (1925) 144, IX (1927) 115, X (1928) 9. — It is gratifying to come across several references to *E. S.* in this volume, chiefly to the series of articles on historical syntax contributed by the late Professor Van der Gaaf. His article on the Progressive Form in *Neophilologus* XV, 3, April 1930, seems to have escaped Jespersen's attention.

³ "Such constructions are blamed by many Britishers, who (wrongly) think them to be chiefly used in U.S."

E. S. XXIII. 1941.

"The normal construction [in the case of Subject + Infinitive after Verbal Phrase] is with the *to*-infinitive," Jespersen goes on to say: "*Verb + on (upon)*: Swift 3.365 I looked upon myself to be fully settled for life." But in the case of *look at* and *listen to* the 'normal' alternative is a construction with a present participle:

I've been over in the Crooked Billet just now, listening to your old men talking.
Macdonell, *England, their England* (Albatross ed.), p. 228.

The sort of writer who uses *listen to him talk* will sometimes employ the present participle construction as well with a slightly different meaning. Thus in Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* we find *Listen to him talk about the Abruzzi* (Tauchnitz ed., p. 10), and *Listen to it rain* (p. 121), but *I listened to them discussing it* (p. 78) and *Look at it snowing now* (p. 286), the grammatical aspect in the sentences with a present participle being explicitly durative, whereas in the examples with an infinitive duration is merely implied. Jespersen has two examples of the participle construction elsewhere (9.95): Johnson, *Rasselas* 85: 'listen to one of the maidens reading in the shade', and Kipling, *Stalky & Co* 281: 'listening to Mac playing the fiddle', which, however, he fails to link up with the pattern just discussed.

Among verbs that are now often followed by *for* + subject + infinitive, though they do not otherwise take *for*, Jespersen mentions *to say*: Allingham P 212: She said for you all to go in. There is no observation on the social status of this construction, which strikes us a distinctly sub-standard. We have noted one instance ourselves:

"Hmm. Did he ask for the amount in any specific fashion?"
"Yes, sir. He said for me to give him the three thousand in small bills. Nothing over a twenty."
Ellery Queen, *The American Gun Mystery*, p. 163.

It seems to have escaped Jespersen's attention that *to say* is also construed with a *to*-infinitive without a subject:

I woke Georgetti, the other boy who was drunk, and offered him some water. He said to pour it on his shoulder and went back to sleep.
Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms*, p. 78.

I explained the game, and Pop was amused, but said not to put names like that on the outside of the letter.
Chr. Morley, *Kitty Foyle*, p. 102.

We have noted four more examples, all of them American. Here is our only English example so far:

"Why is that kept locked, Mr. Godfrey?"
"..... So Rector said to fix a lock the way they couldn't get the trap-door open."
Dorothy Sayers, *Nine Tailors* (Alb. ed.), p. 67.
[The speaker is a man from the village greasing the bells in the belfry.]

The example after *to want* given in 18.73 (verbs which in other constructions, too, are combined with *for*) should have been put in the same division with that after *to say*: Galsw P 10.62 [dial.] I wanted for yū to know, zurr, that ... That the construction is not merely rustic appears from the following quotation:

I always wanted so for things to be beautiful.

Chr. Morley, *Kitty Foyle*, p. 333.

In 21.14 it is said that the late poet laureate Robert Bridges (d. 1930) distinguished the conjunction 'that' from the demonstrative as *that* and *thatt*, but found no followers. I do not know if this is quite true: V. Sackville-West makes the same distinction in *Family History* (1932), though in her 'Foreword' to that novel she speaks of it as an 'innovation'. Are we to assume that she hit upon the idea independently?

In 21.510 it is observed that *in case* generally differs from *if* by implying a preparation for future eventualities. It is not, however, pointed out that in three of the nine examples given *in case* is equivalent to *for fear (that)*, *lest*: Di N 641 I'll not hint 'em my suspicions now, in case you should be disappointed. Another of Jespersen's examples is from Somerset Maugham's *Of Human Bondage*, from which we have noted a few more, one of which will suffice here:

He dared not move then in case he woke her. (p. 368.)

Inversely, as observed by Jespersen in 21.95, *lest* is sometimes used = *in case* (in its 'normal' meaning): Crofts Ch 61 He slipped the man a couple of shillings lest his good offices should be required in the future.

★

These remarks, let us repeat, are offered in no cavilling spirit, but as evidence of the interest with which we have studied this volume. Much could be added, but a review is not the place to copy all one's marginal notes and half one's card-index into. The final impression left by this work and reinforced rather than otherwise towards the end by such chapters as those on the Pseudo-Imperative ("He was a man, take him for all in all"), and on Questions, is one of astonishing wealth of materials and of remarkable acumen in classification. All students of English will join us in congratulating Professor Jespersen on his performance and in expressing the hope that he may live to see his Grammar completed.⁴

Groningen.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

⁴ As we go to press, we receive yet another publication of the indefatigable author: *Efficiency in Linguistic Change* (København, Einar Munksgaard, 1941, 90 pp., Dan. Cr. 4,50). A review will shortly appear.

Roper's Life of More. Edited by E. V. HITCHCOCK, Ph. D., D. Lit. Pp. li + 142. Oxford University Press: for the Early English Text Society (Original Series, No. 197). 1935. 10 s.

Sir Thomas More and His Friends. By E. M. G. ROUTH, F. R. Hist. S. Pp. xxii + 251. Oxford University Press. 1934. 12 s. 6 d. net.

A good many books on More have appeared in recent years, many no doubt called forth by the canonisation. They classify themselves immediately, therefore, into those which would have appeared anyhow and those which but for the interest in More aroused by his canonisation would perhaps not have been written.

No one will dispute the claim of Dr. Hitchcock's book to belong to the first group. All modern biographies must be based on the early Lives of More, and this is the second of Dr. Hitchcock's great series of critical editions of these. Roper's Life, which is chronologically the first, has often been printed, and Dr. Hitchcock began, therefore, with the important Life by Harpsfield, which had never been published until her edition appeared in 1932¹. The preparation of this monumental edition, in which she had the collaboration of Prof. R. W. Chambers, necessitated, however, constant reference to the Roper text, and her edition of Roper's Life is therefore to some extent complementary to the larger volume, to which there is frequent reference, especially in the Historical Notes. But whereas in the Harpsfield volume everything was new, Dr. Hitchcock laments here that, although this is the first critical edition of the oft-printed Roper, "on account of the innocuous nature of the variants, the result of the labour of collating the manuscripts is rather disappointing" (p. vii). But even if it appears "only as an old friend in a new dress" there is ample justification for the new edition, for, as Miss Hitchcock says, "as long as these variants remained untested and unrecorded, the text of the older editors could not be blindly accepted as authentic" (p. vii). And to present a work that is not only an old but a highly valued friend in a dress that we can confidently accept as genuine, no amount of labour, even that involved in a complete collation of thirteen MSS., is labour lost. For this is the standard edition of Roper's *Life of More*, which Prof. Chambers has described as "probably the most perfect little biography in the English language" (*Thomas More*, p. 24). And besides the text Dr. Hitchcock has given us valuable supplementary matter. After a detailed description and a discussion of the relationship of the Roper MSS. and a note on the printed editions, follows a fully documented biographical sketch of Roper containing much material here assembled for the first time and some new matter supplied by Prof. C. J. Sisson. This is concluded by an interesting discussion and list of Roper's "somewhat surprising" errors in his Life of

¹ See *English Studies* XV (1933), pp. 28-31.

his father-in-law, which, however, "are but minor blemishes. For of all the *More Lives*, Roper's ranks as the *biographia princeps*" (p. xlvii). Twenty-four pages of Historical Notes annotate the *Life*, giving valuable information about the family of More's first wife, Jane Colt; about More's sons-in-law, William Daunce and Giles Heron; and about the Clements, to mention a few of the most important topics; while helpful family trees of the Ropers, Colts, Herons and showing the marriage relationships of the Mores, Heywoods, Rastells and Clements are also supplied, as well as one tracing the Eyston branch of More's family to the present day, down to little Thomas More (b. 1931) and his twin sister and younger brother John. "Four centuries after More's execution they carry on his name, and a Lord Chancellor's simple drinking-mug and a Bishop's wooden walking-staff are their priceless possessions. By 1603 the stock of the royal murderer was no more, and no relic of kingly pomp compares with little Thomas More's inheritance" (p. viii).

A summary analysis of the contents of the *Life* (whose arrangement "often lacks sequence" (p. xlix, note)), the running marginal résumé customary in the E.E.T.S. editions, a Glossary, and a General Index, together with a reproduction of the most beautiful of the Holbein portraits of More, that formerly in the Huth Collection, complete a most attractive volume. Miss Hitchcock having now made available the two primary English biographies of More, we look forward with the keenest interest to her forthcoming edition of another little-known *Life of More*, the first and best of the later Tudor composite Lives, that in the "masterly Elizabethan English" of the mysterious "Ro. Ba.", whom Dr. Hitchcock may yet succeed in identifying. We wish her all success.

The series of modern Lives of More opens with the standard Victorian biography, Bridgett's *Life and Works of Sir Thomas More* (1891), which, as Prof. Chambers has said, "can never be superseded". But since Bridgett's pioneer work much has been done: sources which he was the first to use have been further explored and new material has accumulated. There was thus a need for an up-to-date full-length study. But this is the age of the professional biographer, who studies his hero for a year or two, writes a clever, often brilliant essay, and then passes on to his next subject. Many recent books on More fall into this category, being comparatively brief general sketches, giving under such headings as More as scholar and writer, as father and friend, as lawyer and ambassador, as Chancellor and as Martyr, the main lines of his story. They retell from slightly differing angles and with varying emphasis and proportion a familiar and ever-attractive tale, and are suggestive essays valuable rather for the light they throw on particular aspects of More's life and times than for their whole picture. Fortunately a full-scale biography is not needed every day, but the danger is that the dashing, witty sketch, though pleasant enough reading, may be lamentably superficial and unreliable.

The best recent book on More is undoubtedly that by Prof. Chambers,

which is a nature and well-balanced interpretation based on half a lifetime's study of More. His book is, however, usefully supplemented by Miss Routh's *Thomas More and His Friends*, the two books together giving in a reasonable compass all that one could well desire.

Miss Routh's chief aim has been to present as fully as possible within the limits of a moderate-sized volume the facts of More's life, and in her 250 pages she has assembled a large amount of material, well arranged and fully documented. Her book takes account of all the recent work on More, and some matter, notably a series of notes by Miss Jamison on More's official life, is published here for the first time. Her plan is chronological, yet by taking a short time-unit — each chapter covers only a few years, and some important years have a chapter to themselves — she achieves without much overlapping a subject-matter classification also, only one or two chapters falling outside the strictly chronological scheme. Moreover, she lets the facts speak for themselves. Not that she refrains from comment altogether, but on the whole she avoids the discussion of controversial topics, her account being admirably impartial. This being so, it is the more to be regretted that she should depart from her usual moderation in condemning so roundly More's opposition to Tyndale's New Testament: "The scornful hostility of More to this noble work is one of the saddest incidents in his literary life" (p. 193) — for More's attitude was not unjustified. But this is the most serious blemish in a very sympathetic study. A few other points may be noted. More was almost certainly born, not on 7 Feb. 1477, but on 6 Feb. 1478, as has been shown by Prof. Chambers, whom Miss Routh quotes mistakenly in favour of the other view (p. 1). On p. 6 Dr. Reed's initials are reversed (they should be A. W.). On p. 48, note 4, after mention of the 1557 edition More's *Richard III* is described as "Reprinted in Grafton's Chronicle, and newly edited by W. E. Campbell ...": apart from the omission of the date of Grafton's Chronicle the choice is somewhat invidious, seeing that the *Richard III* was printed so often in Tudor chronicles, both before and after 1557. Nor does there seem to be any evidence that the fragmentary *Richard III* was "little thought of by More's friends, and still less by himself" (p. 50) other reasons than lack of interest amply account for its abandonment. And I do not think it is true to say that "Fisher lived very much out of the world" (p. 163) — he was often at Court, where he was much in demand as a preacher. The title of the book is perhaps misleading, for More's friends do not receive more attention than is appropriate in a biography of More. It is a pity that Miss Routh did not turn her list of "principal authorities" into a classified bibliography of More's Works, the early Lives and modern studies, for this would have been very welcome. As it is it is rather haphazard: a number of books mentioned in the foot-notes do not appear in the list; while some very useful books (e.g., Bremond's *Blessed Thomas More*, Lumby's edition of the *Richard III* and Taft's of the *Apology*, and the Everyman reprint of the *Dialogue of Comfort*

against *Tribulation*, the only easily accessible edition of this great book²) are not mentioned at all; and for several of More's last letters reference is given only to the appendix of Singer's not very accessible 1822 edition of Roper's *Life of More*. Still, these are only details. A word of praise is due for the illustrations, which include not only the Huth portrait of More that is also reproduced in Miss Hitchcock's Roper and the Matsys portraits of Erasmus and Peter Giles that are given in the Harpsfield edition, but also Holbein's series of drawings of the More family: the Basel portrait group, the doubtful B. M. Margaret Roper, and the Windsor Castle sketches of old Judge More, Elizabeth Daunce (which I do not remember seeing reproduced elsewhere), Cecily Heron, young John More, and Margaret Gigs, besides the Windsor drawing of Fisher; while there are also portraits of Colet, Warham, Tunstall and Thomas Cromwell. Students of More will be grateful to Miss Routh for her modest and capable study.

Nijmegen.

W. A. G. DOYLE-DAVIDSON.

The Plays of John Marston. In three volumes. Edited from the earliest texts with Introduction and Notes by H. HARVEY WOOD. Edinburgh-London: Oliver and Boyd. 1939. Volume Three. Pp. xxxii-324. Price 15s. net. (The Blackfriars Dramatists, ed. by H. Harvey Wood).

We conclude our review of this edition of Marston's plays (see *English Studies*, XVII, 4, August 1935, and XXI, 1, February 1939) in the same strain as we began: Marston's plays have disappointed more readers than those of any other Elizabethan dramatist. *The Insatiate Countess*, which comes first and foremost in this third and last volume, seems as good a title as may be found for a typical Elizabethan tragedy of lust and blood. Marston, however, can hardly be described as a typical product of his age; he strove *invita Minerva* to achieve supreme originality, at least in style; therefore we may reasonably expect his drama to contain something very different from what the title announces. It is, of course, wrong, as Mr. Harvey Wood points out, to approach Marston's play in the spirit of T. S. Eliot's remark: "We have known this sort of thing done better by another dramatist; it is not worth going to Marston for what Webster can give us". Apart from the misleading impression conveyed by this remark (Webster's *White Devil* is later than *The Insatiate Countess*), nobody who is familiar with Marston would expect him to imitate any of his contemporaries: he utilizes them, as he does Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* in this play, but the stamp is so much his own that his borrowings become quite unrecognizable in the new surroundings. This at least must

² Since superseded by Mgr. Hallett's edition (1937).

be granted to Marston (because we agree with Mr. Harvey Wood in holding Marston, rather than Barksteed, ultimately responsible for *The Insatiate Countess*): that whatever he eventually succeeded in making of Bandello's story of the countess of Challant, he did not exploit it in the usual manner of the Elizabethans. As a parody of the Elizabethan stage, *The Insatiate Countess*, with its comic sub-plot overshadowing the purported main theme, might almost be a success (I say *almost*, because nothing of Marston's can be termed a success). The tragic plot has all the mechanical stiffness of such plots in late *commedia dell'arte* products, where the tragedy offers only a pretext for the horse-play of the zany: no one would take seriously countess Isabella, passing from one love to another without any apparent physical or psychological motivation; she is by definition insatiate, and up and down she must go, as monotonously as a bucket in a well; rigid and determined she paces the stage, a very automaton of a woman, whereas men are seen tottering all round; not metaphorically tottering, but actually wobbling on their feet; momentous events depend on Massino's falling by accident into Isabella's lap while dancing a lavolt, and on Mendoza's falling from the top of the ladder while ascending to Lady Lentulus' window. Where else, but in puppet-shows, have we heard silly magniloquent lines such as these in the fourth act:

False Count Massino, treacherous Gniaca,
Counties of Gazia, and of rich Massino —

or :

Fames register to future times shall tell
That by Don Sago, Count Massino fell.

Sure as we are of the utter preposterousness of the whole play (which Legouis, in his literary history, seems to have swallowed whole, as he calls it "un drame puissant, peinture des fureurs amoureuses d'une sorte de Messaline"), we feel equally certain that a parody was not exactly the thing Marston intended to write. Lines are put into Isabella's mouth which sound as earnest as any ever uttered by romantic nymphomaniacs:

Trembling desire, feare, hope, and doubtfull leasure,
Distill from love the Quintessence of pleasure.

Another Isabella, the heroine of D'Annunzio's *Forse che sì forse che no*, uses more eloquent words to analyse the painful joys of incest, but the main principle — pleasure out of pain — seems to be the same¹. And when Isabella says:

Desire, thou quenchlesse flame that burn'st our soules,
Cease to torment me ...

does not such a beginning bring back to one's mind Sappho's celebrated lines? Neither a parody, nor a tragedy, *The Insatiate Countess* is a

¹ See M. Praz, *The Romantic Agony*, Oxford University Press, 1933, p. 265.

hybrid product, typical of that hybrid talent that was Marston's; a talent streaked with many a curious strain (occasionally, he seems to anticipate Dryden, as we noticed elsewhere; sometimes, as it seems to Mr. Harvey Wood, he reveals more than a suggestion of the self-conscious neurasthenic melancholy of the Eliot school of poets), but, on the whole, abortive and repellent, and as misshapen as the names of characters in *The Insatiate Countess*, grotesquely transmogrified from the Italian (e.g. the count of Cajazzo of the source becomes Gniaca, count of Gazia). A bizarre author, one merit should in any case be allowed him, according to Mr. Harvey Wood:

No writer of the age ever got nearer to what is surely the end of all dramatic endeavour, an approximation to the speech of common men in common life — 'a language such as men do use' — than Marston often did. To this end, he appears to have studied the speech-mannerisms of his contemporaries as closely and remorselessly as Leonardo studied the unconscious grimaces and facial distortions of the Florentines. The elegant, languid 'Good-bye' of the affected gallant; the 'Um' and 'ha' of the sententious courtier; stutterings and malapropisms, the slang of the streets, play-scrap, proverbial tags — he notes and uses them all. But his most original and valuable quality is his power of reproducing the sensitive and variable flow of normal speech, with all its irregularities, its repetitions, its intervals and resumptions, its broken and assumed thought connections, and its liability to complete disorganisation by emotional disturbance.

Notes to such an author ought to offer wide scope to the erudite and the lexicographer; Mr. Harvey Wood's notes are not, however, so valuable as his well-balanced introduction. He points out that "Shakespearian echoes, from *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and other plays, occur throughout *The Insatiate Countess*, and will be noted as they occur." Accordingly, one would expect a note to the passage in the first act:

- Miz. Remember, Sir, this is your wedding day,
And that triumph belongs onely to your wife.
Rogero. If you be noble let me cut off his head.
Gui. Remember o'the other side, you have a maidenhead of your owne
to cut off.

The joke is obviously derived from *Romeo and Juliet*, I, 1, 25 ff.:

- Sam. 'Tis all one, I will show myself a tyrant: when I have fought with
the men, I will be cruel with the maids; I will cut off their heads.
Gre. The heads of the maids?
Sam. Ay, the heads of the maids, or their maidenheads ...

The source has escaped both Marston's editors, Bullen and Harvey Wood. In the first act Mendoza talks somewhat like Mercutio, in the second, under Lady Lentulus' window, like Romeo in the famous orchard scene, thus:

Darken the world, earths-Queene, get thee to bed;
The earth is light while those two Starres are spread:
Their splendor will betray me to mens eyes,
Vaile thy bright face: for if thou longer stay,
Phoebus will rise to thee, and make night day.

In the Bibliography we see no mention of Prof. Ferdinando Neri's important essay on *La Contéssa di Challant* in the *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XCVIII, 1931, p. 225 ff.

Mr. Harvey Wood, unlike the average scholar, does not seem particularly attracted to the labour of commenting. He gives notes for *The Insatiate Countess*, but prints only the text of the other plays of this volume (*East-Ward Hoe*, *Jacke Drums Entertainment*, *Histrion-Mastix*). "The reason for this is not in each case the same. *Eastward Hoe* is commonly included in editions of Chapman and Jonson, and has been frequently issued as a separate publication In the case of the other two plays, printed in the appendix to the volume, considerations of space forbade the inclusion of illustrative notes. This is regrettable, but it would, in my opinion, have been more regrettable to have omitted either of the texts." We hope that this practice of scamping part of their duties does not spread among editors of old texts; but we agree with Mr. Harvey Wood that the texts waiting for his commentary had little in them to attract an interpreter; for instance *Jacke Drum's Entertainment* "has little justification for existence ... few more wretched and uninspired productions have ever been presented on the stage".

Rome.

MARIO PRAZ.

The Orient in American Transcendentalism. A Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott. By ARTHUR CHRISTY. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) New York: Columbia University Press. 1932.

It is late in the day to offer a review of this book after several competent appreciations have already appeared, but on the European Continent the study of the earlier stages of American letters is still not in a position to be supercilious about dates and valuable work will always be welcome. And Dr. Christy's book is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the sources of American transcendentalist thought, especially the thought of Emerson. It goes over ground largely already covered by Harris in his *Teachers of Emerson* and Carpenter in his *Emerson and Asia*, but the author, born and bred in the Orient, is able to offer a wealth of detailed material that presses his thesis home with considerable force. This thesis, however, is not what the title of the book leads one to expect, for the chapters on Thoreau and Alcott are not nearly so weighty as the one on Emerson. The chief point in Thoreau's orientalism, so far as it is treated here, lies in the fact that he probably had the conception of the Indian *yogi* in mind when he retreated to the woods to gather the material for *Walden*, while Alcott's orientalism as presented by Mr. Christy was chiefly of a Yankee and practical sort which made itself useful as a medium for

the distribution of books on the field in America. In both these chapters it is assumed that the thought of their subjects, so far as it was orientalistic, was identical with that of their master Emerson, so that the transcendentalism under consideration is really that of the Seer of Concord who did not personally regard himself as a Transcendentalist at all.

A heavier hand, with this material at its disposal, would have made the most of its chance and constructed an elaborate case of "influence" as an essential foundation of Emersonian philosophy. Mr. Christy is very careful to avoid such a pitfall, stating at the outset that Emerson was a far too superficial reader for such a thesis, that his deliberate eclecticism sought rather confirmation and formulation for his own thinking than any new matter and that he and his friends were interested only in the "tones and overtones of the literatures of India, China and Persia". They read these literatures, of course, in translations — strangely enough, in an age when German was a fashionable language, chiefly in English and French books, except von Hammer-Purgstall's work on the Persian poets; the Appendix gives a long and profusely annotated list of these works. For the benefit of the average reader not conversant with the subject the introduction contains a short summary of the philosophical literature of the East that the Concord men read.

Emerson's preoccupation with oriental thinkers began about 1820, when he was 17 years old, and it influenced above all his conception of the Over-soul. But Mr. Christy is far from identifying Emerson's conceptions with those of the East and is very careful to point out the essential differences as well as the often only verbal and superficial similarities. Emerson used the ideas he found in Oriental literature as a reflection of "his own moods, impulses and spiritual experience", so that "in formulating his doctrine of the Over-Soul he paralleled the Vedanta, but in the application of his doctrine he was Christian", though "he was ever reluctant to grant a definite answer" to the question "whether his was a personal or impersonal God". On the other hand: "Emerson's doctrine of polarity is but the attempt of a Massachusetts man to state the law by which Brahma governs itself", though his optimism is the direct opposite of the attitude of indifference of the Oriental mind toward the world. His idealism with regard to the phenomenal world is, of course, rooted in the Platonism of Western Europe, but it is closely akin to the Maya of the Hindus, who gave him "a terminology, a poetic imagery, and a deeper insight". His seeming blindness "to the difference between the scientific principle of evolution and the moralistic laws of compensation", says Mr. Christy, "disappears when his thought is taken in conjunction with the Vedanta". Though Emerson's conception is not identical with that of the Hindus, the apparent contradiction in his ideas resolves itself in the light of the Maya doctrine. In his use of the Karma conception, too, he betrays the peculiar dualism of his philosophical roots, for whereas his Law of Compensation goes the same road with the Hindu thinkers for long stretches, Emerson's conception is essentially Christian and social, while the individualism of

the Hindus is absolute. He himself did not realise this and had so uncertain a grasp of the Hindu doctrine that he was not able to distinguish it from the Mohammedan Kismet when he came across it later on. On a final count "Emerson's eschatology was a very composite affair, made up of Greek, Hindu and modern concepts, among the last — evolution". But "evolution probably became for him a symbol for the upward march of the soul", just as transmigration was probably "more a metaphor of the spiritual career of the soul" in his mind "than the full career of the Hindu's karmic body". The reproach of easy comfortableness and blindness to reality that is often made Emerson for his idealism Mr. Christy would refute with a reference to his reaction to the death of his son; though here again there is probably a Western strain in him that not only knows but wills. For Emerson was not a passive ascetic.

While Hindu philosophy thus quickened and formulated his metaphysical and religious conceptions, the Chinese, especially Confucius — he did not read Lao-Tse — appealed to his practical sense of conduct. "What Confucius gave Emerson was moral corroboration of his observations on men — not the universe". Like the Chinese he believed that conduct influenced the inner man, and from this point of view "the earmarks of a Chinese gentleman were not essentially different from Emerson's". The Mohammedan thought of the Persians, on the other hand, practically gave him nothing that was not already implicit in his own Puritan heritage and what he found in their poetry was entirely of a formal nature. But this, the great wealth of imagery and the unbounded faculty of happy formulation, permeated practically all he wrote. In this respect all the Orientals he read had their wide effects on his writings and even the peculiar oracular style he developed is largely due to their example. And so, with the Oriental thought Emerson accepted clearly marked off from his own and from the mere formal elements that cover so much greater ground in his work, his Orientalistic poetry, above all the poem "Brahma", is seen in a new and a deeper perspective than has heretofore been possible. Into this poem "Emerson distilled the heart of his Hindu readings", it "may well be considered the high-water mark of that flood of Orientalism which inundated Concord during the second quarter of the last century", and it "has no peer, in prose or verse, as a crystallization into the English language of that age-old body of thought which may be denominated Vedic".

The clear, firm style at the author's disposal lends itself most happily to quotation. The book is perhaps all the more persuasive since it is not dogmatic, but acts on the assumption that the working of Emerson's mind can very rarely be strictly defined and must almost always be merely hinted at. Emerson was essentially the mystic whose thoughts were beliefs or even visions, and a sharper, more positive method must inevitably have defeated its own purpose. As it is, we have as a result of Mr. Christy's investigation a flood of strong light on Emerson's thought where before there was not much more than the glimmer of probability.

K. TEN BRUGGENCATE, *Engels Woordenboek*. 13e uitgave, door A. BROERS. Eerste deel, Engels-Nederlands, xiv + 960 pp. Tweede deel, Nederlands-Engels, 1052 pp. Groningen: J. B. Wolters. 1939—1940. Prijs per deel f 3.75.

Ever since A. Broers, in 1926, took charge of Ten Bruggencate's English-Dutch and Dutch-English dictionary, each new edition has been an improvement on its predecessor, and the work has become a model of bilingual lexicography. The editor's death on February 11 deprives us of one of the most capable as well as the most modest workers in the field of English studies, whose dictionary, while in the hands of almost every schoolboy, business-man, journalist or "general reader", is an indispensable book of reference for the professional student as well.

The merits of Broers' revision of Ten Bruggencate have been more than once set out in this journal, and there is no need to repeat what has been said before. On comparison with such works as the Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English and the Concise Oxford French Dictionary one is struck by the absence of etymologies in the English-Dutch work, a feature it shares with Koenen-Endepols' Dutch dictionary, as also with the French and German dictionaries in the same series. While an Englishman can find the origin of every word in his language in a cheap and manageable book like the COD, a Dutchman has to consult such an expensive and bulky volume as Franck-Van Wijk's Etymological Dictionary, a book for the specialist rather than for the general reader. The difference argues an historical interest in one's own and other languages on the one side, and the absence of it on the other.

While in this respect Broers is on a par with Endepols, in two others the English dictionary has the advantage over the Dutch. Endepols still adheres to the method of indicating stress by an accent after the stressed syllable; Broers uses the modern device of a small upright stroke before it. It would be a good thing if the publishers could decide to introduce uniformity in this matter, so as to avoid the confusion that must often result from the use of two contradictory methods of indicating syllable stress.

A defect in Endepols that Broers mostly avoids is a certain prudery in the omission of the names of some parts of the body, and of other words that might give offence to ears polite. The two dictionaries are intended for exactly the same class of readers, so that one fails to see a reason for this different treatment. Would it be absurd to suggest the appointment of a "General Editor" to coordinate the work of the four specialists?

We wish "Ten Bruggencate-Broers", as the dictionary will no doubt continue to be called, every success on its further career. — Z.

Brief Mention

Oorsprong, Eigenaardigheden en Verbreiding van Nederlands „Slang”. Door C. G. N. DE VOOYS. (Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 3, No. 7.) Tweede, herziene druk. 45 pp. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij. 1940. f 0.80.

Dutch students of English and American slang who are interested in the phenomena of their own language may be advised to read the above pamphlet. In a brief and convenient form it reviews the current definitions of the term 'slang', the sources available for the study of Dutch slang, the characteristics of slang, etc., concluding with an enumeration of Dutch slang terms for parts of the body, and for various activities (such as fighting, running, eating, drinking, cheating, and others), and with some remarks on the spread of slang outside its proper sphere. The notes contain useful references to the literature of the subject in Dutch, French, English and German. Perhaps we may draw the author's attention to W. J. Burke, *The Literature of Slang* (New York Public Library, 1939, vii + 180 pp.). — Z.

Terminology. A Handbook for Students of English. By Dr. P. FIJN VAN DRAAT, sometime Professor of English in the University of Utrecht. 108 pp. Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon. 1941. Sewed f 2.50, cloth f 3.40.

A compilation of doubtful value, on topics ranging from the Bayeux Tapestry and Lilli Burlero to Accent, Kenningar, Picaresque Novels, Sandhi and Wyrđ. Its scholarship may be gauged from such statements as that in the 18 c. "Shakespeare's works were at a discount, lacking every and any appreciation", and that in words like *doubt* and *receipt* "the weaker sound (*sic*) is simply entirely given up." For a fuller discussion see *Weekblad voor Gymnasiaal en Middelbaar Onderwijs*, March 6, 1941. — Z.

Bibliography

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA

HEYNE-SCHÜCKING's *Beowulf*. 15. Auflage. Vollkommen umgearbeitet von ELSE VON SCHAUBERT. (Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Literatur-Denkmäler, III. Band.) 1. Teil: Text. 105 pp. 2. Teil: Kommentar. 144 pp. 3. Teil: Glossar. 232 pp. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh. 1940. Price? [To be reviewed.]

Hali Meidhad. Edited from MS. Bodley 34 and MS. Cotton Titus D. xviii by A. F. COLBORN. vii + 143 pp. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard. 1940. Price Dan. Cr. 8.—. [To be reviewed.]

The Text of the Canterbury Tales. Studied on the Basis of all known Manuscripts by J. M. MANLY and E. RICKERT. Eight Volumes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1940. \$ 40.—. [To be reviewed.]

James MacPherson's Ossian. Faksimile-Neudruck der Erstaussage mit Begleitband: Die Varianten. Herausgegeben von O. L. JIRICZEK. In three vols. 4°. Vol. I. *Fingal* 1762. xxxii + 270 pp. Vol. II. *Temora* 1763. xl + 248 pp. Vol. III. Introduction and Variant Readings. c. 240 pp. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1940. Sewed RM. 70.—, cloth RM. 82.—.

Selected Poems (1916—1936). By W. J. TURNER. xii + 211 pp. Oxford University Press. 1939. Price 7s. 6d.

Sonnets — In Exitu Israel — Peace: an Ode. By E. H. W. MEYERSTEIN. xi + 120 pp. Oxford University Press. 1939. Price 5s.

The Tauchnitz Book of Famous Essays. Compiled, and with an introduction by PAUL HEMPEL. 411 pp. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1940. Price? [To be reviewed.]

The Plays of John Marston. In Three Volumes. Edited by H. HARVEY WOOD. Volume Three. xxxii + 324 pp. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1939. Price 15s. [See Review.]

It's Never Too Late to Mend. An edition of Charles Reade's unpublished drama with an introduction and notes by LEONE RIVES. 111 pp. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine. 1940. [To be reviewed.]

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England. By C. E. WRIGHT. ix + 310 pp. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1939. Price 15s. [To be reviewed.]

Figurengestaltung im Beowulf-Epos. Von A. PIRKHOFER. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 87.) vii + 160 pp. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1940. Geh. RM. 8.50. [To be reviewed.]

Piers Plowman: An Interpretation of the A-text. By T. P. DUNNING. 223 pp. New York: Longmans. 1937. \$3.40.

Chaucer's Troilus. A Study in Courtly Love. By T. A. KIRBY. (Louisiana State University Studies, 39.) 337 pp. Louisiana State University Press. 1940. Price \$3.00. [To be reviewed.]

Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. Edited under the direction of the Modern Language Association of America. About 800 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1940. Price \$10.—.

Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose. By S. K. WORKMAN. (Princeton Studies in English, ed. by G. H. Gerould, 18.) 210 pp. Princeton University Press. 1940. Price \$2.00. [To be reviewed.]

Der Einfluss des Erasmus auf die englische Bildungsidee. Von H. EXNER. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Englische Philologie, Band 13.) 159 pp. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt. 1939. RM. 6.80.

Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der Englischen Renaissance. Von B. SIEBECK. (Schriften der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Neue Folge, Band III.) xvi + 198 pp. Weimar: Böhlau. 1939. Reduced price, sewed RM. 7.05, cloth RM. 8.10. [To be reviewed.]

Christopher Marlowe. A Biographical and Critical Study. By F. S. BOAS. x + 336 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1940. Price 15s. [To be reviewed.]

The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. By HAZELTON SPENCER. xx + 495 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1940. Price? [See Review, E. S., XXII, 150-151.]

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von W. KELLER. Band 75. xv + 236 pp. Weimar: Böhlau. 1939. Price? [To be reviewed.]

Shakespeares Staat. Von H. H. GLUNZ. (Frankfurter Wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe, Band 3.) 183 pp. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann. 1940. RM. 6.—; cloth, RM. 8.—. [To be reviewed.]

Der „Hamlet“ Shakespeares. Von H. H. GLUNZ. (Wissenschaft und Gegenwart Nr. 13.) 69 pp. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann. 1940. RM. 1.75. [See Review, E. S., XXII, 155.]

Auffassung und Gestaltung der Cleopatra in der englischen Literatur. Von W. TRAUB. 114 pp. Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch. Boards, RM. 3.20.

Milton's Rhetoric: Studies in his Defense of Liberty. By W. E. GILMAN. (The University of Missouri Studies, Vol. XIV, Nr. 3.) 193 pp. Columbia: University of Missouri. July 1, 1939. Price \$ 1.25. [To be reviewed.]

Milton und Italien. Von A. EGLE. 145 pp. Freiburg i. Br.: Druck von Rudolf Goldschagg. 1940. [To be reviewed.]

Richard Crashaw. A Study in Baroque Sensibility. By A. WARREN. University, La.: Louisiana State University Press. 260 pp. 1939. \$ 3.—.

Die Barocken Stilmerkmale in der englischen, lateinischen und deutschen Fassung von Dr. Thomas Burnets Theory of the Earth. Von E. HALLER. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 9. Band.) xiii + 179 pp. Bern: A. Francke. n. d. [1940.] Sw. Fr. 8.—. [To be reviewed.]

Defoe in the Pillory and other studies. By J. R. MOORE. (Indiana University Publications: Humanities Series No. 1.) Bloomington, Indiana. 1939. Price \$ 2.—. [To be reviewed.]

John Gay: Favorite of the Wits. By W. H. IRVING. xii + 334 pp. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. \$ 3.50.

Perilous Balance. The Tragic Genius of Swift, Johnson and Sterne. By W. B. C. WATKINS. vi + 172 pp. Princeton University Press. 1939. \$ 2.00.

The Epistolary Novel in the Late Eighteenth Century. A Descriptive and Bibliographical Study. By F. G. BLACK. (University of Oregon Monographs: Studies in Literature and Philology. No. 2. April 1940.) 184 pp. Eugene: University of Oregon. 1940. Price \$ 1.25. [To be reviewed.]

Das Historische Drama in England von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart. Von R. FRICKER. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 8. Band.) vi + 363 pp. Bern: A. Francke. 1940. Sw. Fr. 13.50. [To be reviewed.]

Edmund Burke and his Literary Friends. By D. C. BRYANT. (Washington University Studies — New Series. Language and Literature — No. 9.) xii + 323 pp. St. Louis. 1939. Price? [To be reviewed.]

Tradition and Romanticism. Studies in English Poetry from Chaucer to W. B. Yeats. By B. IFOR EVANS. 213 pp. London: Methuen. 1940. Price 6s.

Dickens' Work in Germany, 1837-1937. By E. N. GUMMER. 208 pp. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1940. Price 12s. 6d.

Charles Rêade, sa Vie, ses Romans. Par LÉONE RIVES. 525 pp. Toulouse: Imprimerie Toulousaine. 1940. [To be reviewed.]

Toulouse Diss.

Ten Victorian Poets. Studies of Tennyson, Browning, Matthew Arnold, Clough, D. G. Rossetti, Christina Rossetti, Swinburne, Morris, Hardy. By F. L. LUCAS. xx + 199 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1940. Price 7s. 6d.

Die Metapher in Merediths und Hardys Lyrik. Von H. LITTMANN. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 6. Band.) 485 pp. Bern: A. Francke. [n.d.] Sw. Fr. 14.—. [To be reviewed.]

Has Modern English a Genitive Plural ?

A study in synchronous grammar

As far as we have been able to ascertain, Dr. Kruisinga, in the early editions of his *Handbook of Present-day English*, and his *English Grammar for Dutch Students*, was the first to deny the existence of a Genitive Plural of those nouns that take an *s* in the plural. We quote from the fourth edition of *E. G. D. S.*, vol. I, § 54: "Plural nouns in a sibilant, denoting persons or animals, are sometimes used attributively to express the same meanings as the genitive. It chiefly occurs in groups that resemble compounds. This function of the indefinite case is denoted by the apostrophe." Apparently Dr. Kruisinga reasoned as follows: there is no audible ending to distinguish the plural form in *s'* expressing the function of the genitive from the same form in the functions of subject, object, etc., therefore there is, generally speaking, no genitive plural in English. Even if we accept the simple, if superficial definition of case on which the whole argument appears to be founded, a moment's reflection will show that its consistent application would lead to most startling consequences; on the strength of this definition the argument that in Latin neutral nouns of the *o*-declension have no accusative, because there is no ending to distinguish this case from the nominative would be unanswerable.¹ In the fifth edition of his *Handbook*, as well as of his *E. G. D. S.*, Dr. Kruisinga has expressed somewhat modified views on the attributively used *s'*-plurals, with a result, however, as we propose to show hereafter, that is still far from satisfying our linguistic sense.

It would certainly seem desirable, in any discussion of the genitive, as well as of any other case, to state unequivocally, what, in one's opinion, is the most satisfactory conception of case. We have already stated our objection to such a narrow conception of case as: sound-image varying in accordance with the function of the noun. Poutsma, in *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, defines the genitive as: "a form which is used to express a certain relation between persons, animals and things."² Dr. Poutsma, as appears from his further treatment of the genitive, has not narrowed down the idea of form to sound-image; but, on the other hand, he does not enlighten us as to what should be understood by form, apart from the *'s* of the genitive singular, and the *'* after the plural *s*. Those who are interested in solving puzzles, we would refer to Curme's discussion of the genitive. Curme, after giving the unoriginal definition "Case is

¹ "Any Roman who had any grammatical consciousness at all would doubtless have felt the genitive *aulae* and the dative *aulae* as two separate forms, the outward coincidence of which was purely accidental." Gardiner, *Speech and Language*, p. 146.

² Poutsma, *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, Part II, 1 A, p. 40.

form,"³ wants us, later, to look upon the first element in a group like *the village idiot* as a genitive.

Grattan, in an article entitled: "On the teaching of case,"⁴ quoting Deutschbein's definition of case: Case is the linguistic expression of the relation in which an idea signified by a noun stands to the ideas signified by other component parts of the sentence, remarks: "To single out one of these means (viz. of linguistic expression), namely suffixes, to the total disregard of the rest, is unprofitable." The significant words are: "linguistic expression," used here instead of "form."⁵ So long as there are any characteristics which indicate that speakers are conscious of using a noun in a certain case, distinct from any other case, grammarians must accept the existence of the former case as a linguistic fact, irrespective of whether the noun in this case happens to coincide in form or sound-image with the same word in any other case. And, although, when Grattan goes on to enumerate the other means of linguistic expression he has in mind, besides suffixes, viz.: prefixes, prepositions, postpositions, tone, and word-order, we should like to include one or two more, and perhaps to omit another, in this conception of case we have at least something more promising to go on. We propose, therefore, to find out if there are any other linguistic indications apart from the ' of the genitive relation in which plural nouns in *s'* stand to other component parts of the sentence, i.e., in this case, to other nouns.

The form: plural *s'* is, by common consent of grammarians, far less frequently found in English than the genitive equivalent with *of*. We have not, at the moment, available any statistical data as to the numerical preponderance of the *of*-construction over either the genitive singular or the plural *s'*-form, but it may be worthy of record that of the texts conned for the purpose of gaining a deeper insight into the character of the plural *s'*-form, very few did not yield one or more instances of this construction, and that from a total of 36 novels, short-stories, essays, articles and plays we have been able to list well over 150 instances; we have not listed any instances of the very frequent construction consisting of a plural proper name ending in *s'* followed by "house" (the Browns' house), nor of the corresponding absolute form (the Browns'); although only a few instances have been listed of another frequently occurring group, viz. plural nouns

³ George O. Curme, *Parts of Speech and Accidence* (Vol. II of *A Grammar of the English Language* by H. Kurath and G. O. Curme), p. 127.

⁴ *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, Vol. IX (1921), pp. 115-125. Deutschbein's own words are: "Der Kasus drückt die Beziehung aus, in der die einzelnen Nominal-(bez. Pronominal)begriffe zu den übrigen Satzgliedern stehen."

⁵ The question whether "case" or "function" be the more appropriate term, falls outside the scope of this article. We would only point out that, whereas Gardiner prefers "function" to "case" ("behind ["function"] always lies the verdict of a skilled interpreter"; *Speech and Language*, p. 147), for our present purpose, to find out whether the *s'* plurals show any linguistic characteristics in common with the singular 's form, "case" seems the more suitable term.

of time and distance linked to the following noun by ', this group will be dealt with in the course of our discussion.

When dealing with these plural *s'*-forms, another question will have to be faced. Are these forms, properly speaking, plurals? Kruisinga has raised the point (*E. G. D. S.*, 5th edition, p. 20, and *Handbook*, 5th edition, Vol. II, § 907). "It must be remembered", he remarks, "that in the spoken language there is nothing to indicate the plural, except the context ... And an attributive plural genitive would be difficult to account for, as attributive nouns take the stem form in all cases when the genitive is not used". And he draws a parallel between English "masters' room" and Dutch words such as "leraarskamer" and "haar meisjeskamer". Still, the stem-form is not used in the combination "masters' room", and some explanation of the occurrence of the *s'* will have to be found. The only logical conclusion, assuming that this *s* does not indicate the plural, would be to look upon it as indicating the genitive of a singular noun. This obviously logical, but essentially absurd, conclusion Kruisinga does not care to draw, and he appears to us to prefer to edge out of the predicament when, quite wrongly, as will presently be shown, he remarks that "English genitive-groups with a plural meaning are chiefly used in standing combinations, as in 'the Eighty Years' War'". We shall, in this article, deal with the problem of accounting for the occurrence of *s'* as occasion arises.

Our investigation has shown us the desirability of analysing the linguistic characteristics of each of three distinct types of plural *s'*-groups and of comparing them with the characteristics of the corresponding singular *s'*-groups.

1. Groups closely resembling compounds (Curme calls them: Genitives of Characteristic, Poutsma: Classifying Genitives), e.g.:

But she wears widows' caps, ma'am? (Gaskell, *Cranford*.)

The police might well suppose that his murder was the result of a gangsters' quarrel. (Somerset Maugham, *Christmas Holiday*.)

Through this wilderness of stonemasons' dementia one gained the great house. (Willard Connely, *The reign of Beau Brummell*.)

and many others:

poets' licence, a figment of detective fictionists' imagination, ordinary commonplace tourists' talk, a ladies' man in the worst sense of the word, etc.

2. Groups consisting of a noun denoting time or distance ending in *s'*, followed by another noun (Genitive of Measure).

a five minutes' walk; a three hours' delay; a ten miles' walk.

3. Groups of which the first element denotes the possessor, the subject,

They rummage in bedroom drawers, in their parents' writing desks, and in boxes in the attic. (Robert Graves, *Antigua, Penny, Puce.*)

He took the book back to where the girls' things were lying. (*ibid.*)

On First Nights he would discuss the actors' merits and demerits and he did not mind saying "The play's lousy" in the hearing of critics standing in the foyer. (George Buchanan, *The Soldier and the Girl.*)

Each party's arguments seem to me equally futile and each party's emotional attitude equally deplorable. Thus the lowbrows' appeal to numbers cuts no ice. (Aldous Huxley, *I am a Highbrow.*)

and many others :

the other two ladies' faces, his guests' glasses, the detectives' work, the servants' testimony, my clients' affairs, those very clients' tender innocence, the bold Nomads' few plaited locks, the others' exclamations, etc. etc.

Groups with "sake" for their second element are not discussed, because they were not found to shed any additional light on the matter in hand.

Type 1.

In my search after facts, I was often reminded of a description my father had once given of a ladies' committee that he had had to preside over. (Gaskell, *Cranford.*)

Is *s'* in "ladies' committee" the termination of an endingless genitive plural noun, or of the common case of a plural noun, or is it the genitive ending of a singular noun? The spelling "ladies'" appears a strong indication of the writer's consciousness of using a plural form; besides there are many combinations such as "children's hour", "thieves' den", the first elements of which are beyond any doubt plural forms. Comparing "lady's maid" with "ladies' committee", and "children's hour" with "child's play", the most plausible inference would seem that the *s'*-nouns of this type are plurals, when denoting plural persons: ladies' committee: committee composed of ladies; children's hour: hour devoted to a programme interesting for children; but actually there is no small number of exceptions: child labour: labour performed by children; girl's clothes: clothes worn by girls, is also spelt girls' clothes. The following is an instance of a form with a singular spelling where a plural form would naturally be expected.

Has he been in the habit of attending farmhouse auctions, or prowling about in labourer's cottages? (R. Austin Freeman, *The Penrose Mystery.*)

There is of course no audible difference between "labourer's", and "labourers'", and the possibility of a printer's error ought to be taken into account (though the example was taken from a carefully printed text); there is an audible difference, however, between the singular form used and the plural form expected in :

I hate the ladies' side at a man's club. (J. C. Masterman, *Fate Cannot Harm Me.*)

where man's club: club for men, is used in the same breath, and quite

illogically, with the ladies' side: room reserved for ladies. The consciousness of the "plurality" of the first element does not seem so strong as to exact a consistent use of a plural form, even in cases where this plural would be perfectly logical.

When the *s*-plural denotes persons or animals the ' is applied in modern English, i.e., from the end of the eighteenth century, fairly consistently. Does this indicate that the genitive-consciousness on the part of English writers and speakers is correspondingly strong? We believe not. When one finds the ' used in a case like the following, where its occurrence is not justified by common usage (goods train, goods van):

Her appointments' sheet was full from ten in the morning until six at night. (Anthony Gilbert, *Murder has no Tongue*.)

the suspicion that its use is not dictated by any genitive-consciousness on the part of the writer begins to arise; this suspicion is further strengthened by the contemplation of such pairs as "birds' nests" — "mice nests". Whereas in "birds' nests" the ' is conscientiously applied, genitive-consciousness is not sufficiently strong to demand an 's, which might logically be expected (cf. children's hour) in "mice nests".

Apart from these occasional inconsistencies in the use of ' and 's, there are other linguistic indications which tend to prove that the relation between the first and second elements in the combinations of this type is essentially different from the genitive relation in other combinations. No adjective can be placed between the two elements of such a combination as "the girls' room" (*de meisjeskamer*), whereas "the girl's new room" (and "the girls' new room" as well): *de nieuwe kamer van het meisje* (*de meisjes*), would be perfectly natural. Apparently the combinations of this type have very much the character of inseparable compounds. This also explains why the first element is never found in post-position, as the undoubted genitive is in: "Is this book yours or your brother's?". In other words: it is not capable of being used in the same syntactic connections as an undoubted genitive, it has a different syntactic potency. Syntactic potency, though undeniably, in contrast with inflectional endings, prefixes, etc., an indirect means of linguistic expression, is none the less a valuable aid in grouping certain linguistic phenomena (such as case) in a language which has hardly any inflectional endings.

Lastly there is stress, a direct means of linguistic expression. The first element in the combinations of this type is more strongly stressed than the second; in combinations of a non-compound character, both nouns are evenly stressed (apart, of course, from variations of stress resulting from special circumstances: rhythm, the necessity to bring out contrast, etc.). Cf.:

..... a description my father had once given of a 'ladies' committee (Gaskell, *Cranford*.)
and :

There is no one to say what Dr Gerard's movements were when he reached the camp, because the two 'ladies' 'backs were towards it. (Agatha Christie, *Appointment with Death*.)

I've had a bellyful of 'farmers' ,promises, I have, and I tell you straight. (F. Brett Young, *The Black Diamond*.)

and :

To David it seemed that the 'farmers' 'ways were a tempting of Providence. (John Buchan, *The Faithful Servant*.)

Now, having seen that there is not always sufficient indication to prove that the first elements of the combinations of this type are undoubted plurals in function and in the speakers' (or writers') consciousness, and secondly that apart from the ' the ending has none of the linguistic characteristics of the genitive, we are unavoidably faced by the question: What is the function of this *s*' (or '*s*'; what has been said of the absence of genitive characteristics of the plural forms, whether actually plural or only seemingly so, applies to the undoubted genitive-form of singular first elements as well)? In most cases it seems to function as a mere link between the two elements of the combination, comparable to the hyphen in similar nominal combinations. Frequently, however, it appears to indicate a different relation of the first element to the following noun from that expressed by the same element used without *s*. Thus we find: "lady-companion": paid female attendant of rather superior position and education; "lady's companion": sort of lady's bag; "lady-friend": female friend; "ladies' man", also spelt: "lady's man": one who is fond of society of ladies and who makes efforts to attract and please them by being particularly polite and obliging. (Wyld, *Universal English Dictionary*.) The *s*-form seems never to be used to express an object relation between the two elements; hence "lady-killer, bird-fancier", but "bird's nest" or "birds' nest(s)".

Type 2.

a ten minutes' delay; a five miles' walk.⁶

The uninflected singular forms are found side by side with the apparent plural forms; in the only case of a noun denoting measure not having a regular *s*-plural (viz. foot), the apparent plural form is never used in combinations of this type: a five-foot jump. Moreover, nouns denoting value, and other nouns used attributively to denote measure or size, are only found in the undoubted singular form (a sixpenny cigar, a five-pound note). The conclusion appears natural that in those cases where the first element ends in *s*, this *s* cannot be considered as having a plural-denoting function; "miles" in "a five miles' walk" cannot possibly be held to express a stronger degree of plurality than "mile" in "a five-mile

⁶ Frequently, of course, combinations with nouns denoting time or distance for their first elements belong to class 1, e.g. "a summer's day, a boat's length"; like the other combinations of class 1, they have the strongest stress on the first element, whereas those of class 2 are evenly stressed.

walk". To describe its function as denoting a genitive would be equally futile on precisely the same grounds. And there are other cogent reasons for denying the genitive function of the *s*' in "minutes'" and "miles'". In the spelling the apostrophe, which is never absent in undoubted genitive-words, is not infrequently omitted, even in texts whose conscientious punctuation is a strong plea against the assumption of printers' errors. The ' appears generally to be added owing to mere force of habit, and its omission not to be felt as a "mistake", as the omission of the ' in "the boy's father" would be felt.

He had a three-minutes opportunity of administering the poison, while Mrs. Tucker had at least four hours. (Gerald Bullett, *The Jury*.)

Thanks to the progress made by modern archaeology we are now able to set out on our inquiry with a hope of arriving not at the whole truth — not at as much of it as will be known in, say, ten or twenty years time — but at more than appeared in the history books of the last generation. (R. H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*.)

But even when both the *s* and the apostrophe are added to the nouns of this type, they appear to have what, for want of a better term, we have called the syntactic potency of the attributive adjective rather than of the genitive. An exceptionless rule of English syntax says that *one* used as a substitute for nouns mentioned before cannot be preceded by a genitive: "Your opinion and your partner's," or: "Your opinion and that of your partner". Substitute *one*, however, is found, not only after "uninflected" nouns denoting value, time or distance: "A penny stamp and a three halfpenny one"; "a five-minute talk would be more appropriate than a thirty-minute one", but after the *s*'-ending as well: "The higher course is a two years' one" (*Times Educational Supplement*, 8: viii: 1918.). Apropos of this instance, Curme (*Syntax*, 10 II 2 F b) remarks: "We sometimes feel the inflected genitive here so strongly as an adjective that we treat it as an adjective, adding "one" in substantive function". In our opinion it is absurd to call a form that is so strongly felt as an adjective, a genitive, merely on traditional grounds.

Summing up we may say that the *s*-ending of the nouns of type 2, like that of the nouns of type 1, not necessarily having a pluralizing function, and lacking the fundamental characteristics of a genitive, has become a more or less gratuitous link. (Incidentally, as in type 1, we may point out that the singular 's form (as in: "an hour's journey") which has so far stood unchallenged as expressing the genitive case, cannot, on the same grounds as the plural *s*' form, be said to be indicative of the genitive case either). In order to find out the precise linguistic function of this link, it would be necessary to ascertain, among other things: when and in what connections it first began to appear, and whether the frequency of its occurrence in modern English is increasing or diminishing; why we say: "an hour's interview", and not: "an hour interview"; why we can say "a one hour interview" as well as "a one hour's interview." This would involve the collecting of an enormous mass of material, labour which might not be justified by its result.

Type 3.

The hair of the pupils' heads would stand on end with fright. (Charles Dickens, *The Pickwick Papers*.)

Because they did not go into the linguistic characteristics of each of the so-called genitive-groups of the three types separately, older grammarians called every noun that ended in 's or s', a noun in the genitive. Kruisinga, owing to the same omission, has fallen into the opposite extreme; and, while never calling into question the "genitiveness" of any noun that ends in 's, refuses to acknowledge any noun ending in s' as a genitive plural. In his *Handbook* (vol. 2, § 907), we find: "Two things are clearly shown by the examples quoted (one of the examples contains the group: "your grandparents' golden wedding"), I. that the sentences contain what must be called genitives; II. that the genitive nouns refer to more than one person. The inevitable conclusion seems to be that the attributive genitive⁷ does not distinguish number any more than the attributive noun stem, a conclusion all the more acceptable because it agrees with what might be expected theoretically. The result of our consideration is, therefore, that the attributive noun in living English does not express number by its form."

In our discussion of the s'-forms of type 1 we have stated our opinion that although in the combination "ladies' committee" it is desirable to look upon "ladies'" as a noun in the plural, because in the speakers' consciousness "ladies'" probably represents a plural, it is questionable whether the first elements of many similar groups belonging to the same type, even when ending in -s', are plural in character. Kr., however, asserting that all attributive (genitive) nouns (the first elements, therefore, of all the combinations of our three distinct types) do not by their form indicate plural, and basing his argument purely on considerations of form, inevitably gets into difficulties with undoubted plural forms as "children's, men's, women's". We are referred to § 761: "These plurals with vowel-change must be looked upon as suppletive, rather than inflectional, forms. All of them that denote persons: *men*, *women*, and *children*, are so completely isolated from the corresponding singular that they can take a sibilant suffix to serve as a genitive." This, it appears to us, is mere juggling with terms. Whether the plurals *men*, *women*, *children* are termed suppletive or inflectional forms does not influence the fundamental fact that they are undoubted plural forms.⁸ We have stated it before, but may as well here repeat this maxim: So long as there are no positive indications of any discrepancy between a written form (or sound-image) and its representation in the writers' (or speakers') consciousness, we cannot but accept the identity of form and representation in the mind as a fact.

⁷ Kr. speaks here of: attributive genitive. And as in § 829 it was expressly stated that "English has no genitive plural", the only logical inference appears to be that Kr. wants "parents'" to be considered as representing a genitive singular.

⁸ And what about the forms: "thieves" and "wives"? (the thieves' capture; their wives' absence.) Are they suppletive or inflectional forms?

With the *s'* plurals of the third type this identity is most emphatically a fact. Looking into the character of the *s'* nouns of the first type, we found, besides irregularities in the spelling, undoubted singular forms, side by side with apparent plural forms. The first elements of the combinations of this type generally serve to express that the idea signified by the following noun applies to a class of persons without reference to individuals; and here, as in many other cases, it is not material to our understanding whether in denoting a class of persons the plural form of the noun (ladies' committee) or the singular (man's club) is used. The first elements of the combinations of type 2 are almost purely adjectival in character. The first elements of the combinations of type 3, denoting a plurality of individuals, not a class⁹, have retained all the characteristics possessed by nouns denoting an individual in the singular.

These characteristics include the capacity of being used in the genitive case, irrespective of the absence of an audible genitive ending with most of them when used in an undoubted genitive function. Let us consider what the indications of their genitive character chiefly consist in. In the first place they are unreservedly found in every one of the three categories of relationship to the following noun (possessive, subjective, objective relation, as well as in those numerous other relations that are so difficult to express by means of grammatical terminology) that are characteristic of the genitive singular form. Of both the possessive and subjective relations instances will be found above, p. 68. Curiously enough we have only come across two instances of plural nouns expressing objective relation :

They were ready to fight, not for the abbeys, maybe, or even the Church, but for what they deemed their souls' salvation. (John Buchan, *The Blanket of the Dark*.)

There is no reason to suspect, however, that *s'*-nouns should be of rarer occurrence in the objective relation than *'s* nouns.

Instances of *s'* plurals expressing various other relations (including the relation of origin, which is often indistinguishable from other relations):

He was too contemptuous of his fellows' opinion to extort their admiration by taking up an attitude in which he did not believe. (Somerset Maugham, *Christmas Holiday*.)

There could be no doubt on the evidence that the stamp-collection had in fact been a joint one. Mr. Merlin referred to the sober and unshaken evidence of the parties' old sewing-woman, Mrs. Trent. (Robert Graves, *Antigua, Penny, Puce*.)

If questions were going to be asked by the authorities it would be the servants' testimony that would be reckoned valuable. (Anthony Gilbert, *Murder has no Tongue*.)

His subjects' sorrow is, as their joy was, their instinctive tribute of honour to a life that accepted and transmits the high Victorian concept of private and public duty. (*Times* weekly edition, January 23, 1936.)

⁹ There is no wavering here between plural and singular forms, as in type 1. The plural form is used without any exception.

Finally, a few instances of the occurrence of plural *s'*-nouns in syntactic functions in which the genitive singular is regularly found. The genitive plural as a nominal predicate :

So home you find me, Will, roosting in the cauld rickle of stones that was my forbears', while rumours of war blow like an east wind up the glens. (John Buchan, *Witch Wood*.)

The genitive plural in "absolute" use, to denote a building, is quite as frequent as the absolute genitive singular: "the Browns', the Johnsons'," are both regularly heard in conversation and found in written English.

Of *s'*-nouns in post-position (post-genitive), no instances have actually been listed, but we may safely assume that such a group as "friends of my parents'" is no more unusual than "friends of my brother's".

In attributive use, without repetition of the "headword", plural *s'*-nouns occur frequently :

Through some obscure collaboration of recessive genes she had received eyes quite unlike her parents'. (Richard Aldington, *Seven against Reeves*.)

Karen could not have found a more grateful incuriosity on the subject of love than these two elderly lovers'. (Elizabeth Bowen, *The House in Paris*.)

"Good morning, sir," said George Fern, who had been his secretary for four years now, a time exactly four times as long as any of his predecessors'. (Philip Macdonald, *The Crime Conductor*.)

Substitute "one", which was found to occur after the nouns of type 1, is never used here, as it is never used after the genitive singular; sometimes the headword is repeated :

Some had become rich in their own lifetime, some from their fathers' lifetime. (George Buchanan, *The Soldier and the Girl*.)

We hope that sufficient evidence has been adduced to show that the assumption of the existence of a genitive plural, at least of the nouns belonging to this last type, is quite justified, and that our deductions may help to clear up some of the confusion which, for a long time, has seemed to obscure the true appreciation of the character of the *s'*-plurals.

Groningen.

M. H. BRAAKSMA.

Notes and News

A Note on the Virgil Translation in *Poetaster* V.ii.

As a base for this translation Jonson used Surrey's. I quote below from the Quarto text of *Poetaster*¹, the Tottel and Hargrave versions of Surrey's translation², and the Latin text, in that order.

Poetaster V. ii. 56, etc.³

*Meane while, the Skies gan thunder; and in tayle
Of that, fell pouring stormes of sleete, and hayle :*

Tottel Aen. IV, 206 etc.⁴

*In the meane while the skies (Hargrave⁵ heauens) gan rumble sore ;
In tayle thereof a mingled showr with hayle.*

Virgil Aen. IV, 160 etc.

*Interea magno misceri murmure caelum
incipit, insequitur commixta grandine nimbus.*

(Jonson follows Tottel's 'Skies', not Hargrave's 'heauens'. Surrey accounts for the antiquated 'gan' and the curious 'in tayle' in Jonson. Jonson has intensified the rendering of 'nimbus'.)

58—60 *The Tyrian Lords, and Troian youth, each where
With Venus Dardane Nephew, now, in feare
Seeke out for seuerall shelter through the Plaine ;*

*The Tyrian folk, and eke the Troyans youth
And Venus nephew the cotage, for feare
Sought round about ;*

*et Tyril comites passim et Troiana iuventus
Dardaniusque nepos Veneris diversa per agros
tectata metu petiere.*

(Jonson has precisified the translation of 'comites' from 'folk' to 'Lords'; he has rendered 'passim', which the Tottel version does not; he has worked in 'Dardanius', 'diversa ... tectata' and 'per agros'.)

61 *Whil'st Flouds come rowling from the Hills amaine.
the floods fell from the hills.
ruunt de montibus amnes.*

¹ References by line and page are to Herford and Simpson's edition.

² Tottel, Richard; Certain Bokes of Virgiles Aeneis turned into English meter, by Henry Earle of Surrey, 1557; and the Hargrave MS, an early Elizabethan version. Tottel and Hargrave are quoted from Padelford, Fred. M: The Poems of Henry Howard Earl of Surrey. (University of Washington Publications, Language and Literature vol V, Oct. 1928.)

³ Herford and Simpson vol IV, pp. 296-7.

⁴ Padelford pp. 152 and 4.

⁵ Padelford pp. 153 and 5.

(Jonson has strengthened the equivalent of 'ruunt'.)

62—3 *Dido a Caue, The Troian Prince the same
Lighted upon.*

*Dido a den, the Troyan prince the same
Chaunced vpon.*

(Hargrave: *Quene Dido, with the Troiane prince alone,
Chanst on a denn.*)

*speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem
deveniunt,*

(Jonson shuns the coarse alliteration of 'Dido a den'. 'Lighted' renders 'deveniunt' better than 'Chaunced', because it also indicates the going down.)

63—5 *There, Earth, and Heauens great Dame
That hath the charge of Mariage, first gaue signe
Vnto this Contract ;*

*Our mother then, the Earth,
And Iuno that hath charge of mariage
First tokens gaue*

*prima et Tellus et pronuba Iuno
dant signum :*

65—6 *Fier, and Ayre did shine,
As guilty of the Match ;*

*with burning gledes of flame,
And, priule to the wedlock, lightning skies ;*

*fulsere ignes et conscius aether
conubiis*

66—7 *and from the Hill
The Nymphes, with shriekings, doe the Region fill.*

And the nymphes yelled from the mountains top.

summoque ulularunt vertice nymphae.

68—9 *Here first began their Bane; this Day was ground
Of all their ills :*

*Ay me ! this was the first day of their mirth,
And of their harmes the first occasion eke.*

*ille dies primus leti primusque malorum
causa fuit ;*

(Surrey has taken 'leti' as if it were from laetus, a mistake corrected by Jonson.)

69—70 *For now, nor Rumours sound,
Nor nice respect of State mooues Dido ought ;*

Respect of fame no longer her withholdes,

neque enim specie famave movetur,

71 *Her Loue, no longer now, by stealth is sought :*

Nor museth now to frame her loue by stelth.

nec iam furtivom Dido meditatur amorem.

72—3 *She calls this Wedlocke, and with that faire Name
Couers her fault.*

Wedlocke she calls it; vnder the pretence
Of which fayre name she cloketh now her fault.

coniugium vocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam.

73—4 *Forthwith the Bruit, and Fame,
Through all the greatest Lybian townes, is gone ;*

Forthwith Fame flieth through the great Libian towns

Extemplo Libyae magnas it Fama per urbes

75 *Fame, a fleete Euill, then which is swifter none*

A mischefe Fame — there is none else so swift —

Fama, malum qua non aliud velocius ullum

76 *That moouing growes, and flying gathers strength ;*

That mouing, growes; and flitting, gathers force. (*Hargrave: strength*)

mobilitate viget virisque acquirit eundo

(Here Jonson follows Hargrave and not Tottel.)

77—8 *Little at first, and fearefull; but at length
She dares attempt the Skies,*

First small for dred, sone after climes the skies

parva metu primo, mox sese attollit in auras.

78—9 *and stalking proud
With feet on Ground, her Head doth pearce a Cloud.*

Stayeth on earth (*Hargrave* Percing the erth), and hides her hed in cloudes

ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.

(The Hargrave 'Percing' would appear to be a misprint for 'Pacing'; in any case it seems to have suggested 'pearce' to Jonson. In translating 'ingreditur' Jonson obviously has in mind the distinction made by Quintilian, *Inst.* 9, 4: *sublimia debent ingredi, lenia duci, acria currere, delicata fluere.* Jonson has intensified the antithesis of solo : nubila by that of feete : Head.)

80—81 *This Child, our Parent Earth, stird vp with spight
Of all the Gods, brought foorth;*

Whom our mother, the Earth, tempted by wrath
Of gods, begat;

*illam Terra parens ira inritata deorum ...
... progeniuit*

(By making 'Whom' into 'This Child' Jonson achieves an antithesis. 'brought foorth' is more suitable of a mother than 'begat'.)

81—3 *and, as some wright,
She was last sister of that Giant Race,
That thought to scale Iove's Court.*

the last sister — they write —
To Caeus, and to Enceladus eke;

extremam, ut perhibent, Coeo Enceladoque sororem

83—4 *right swift of Pase,
And swifter, far, of Wing.*

Spedie of foote, of wyng likewise as swift (*Hargrave* right swift)

pedibus celerem et pernicious alis

(Jonson has taken his 'right swift' from *Hargrave*. By translating 'swifter, far' he brings out the stronger sense of 'pernicious' compared with 'celerem'.)

84—7 *A monster vast,
And dreadfull. Looke, how many Plumes are plac't
On her huge Corps, so many waking Eyes
Sticke vnderneath:*

A monster huge, and dreadfull to decriue
In euery plume that on her body sticks —
... As many waker eyes lurk vnderneath,

*monstrum horrendum, ingens, cui, quot sunt corpore plumae,
tot vigiles oculi subter*

(Jonson has used *Surrey's* 'huge' and 'sticks', though differently; neither in Jonson's version corresponds to anything in the Latin.)

87—9 *and (which may stranger rise
In the Report) as many Tongues she beares,
As many Mouthes, as many listning Eares.*

A thing in dede much maruelous to heare — ...
So many mouths to speake, and listning eares.

(Surrey has left out the translation of 'tot linguae', which has been added by Jonson. 'subrigit' has suggested Jonson's 'rise', though used differently.)

90—91 *Nightly, in midst of all the Heauen, she flies,
And through the Earths dark shadow, shrieking, cries ;*

By night she flies amid the cloudie skie,
Shrieking, by the dark shadow of the earth

nocte volat caeli medio terraeque per umbram
stridens

92 *Nor doe her Eyes once bend, to tast sweete sleepe*

Ne doth decline to the swete sleepe her eyes.

(Hargrave: Ne once her eies to swete slepe doth encline)

nec dulci declinat lumina somno

(Jonson has got his 'once' from the Hargrave version.)

93—4 *By Day, on tops of Houses, she doth keepe,
Or on high Towers ;*

By day she sits to mark on the house top, (Hargrave toppes)
Or turrents (Hargrave turrets) hye

luce sedet custos aut summi culmine tecti
turribus aut altis,

(Jonson's plural 'tops' agrees with Hargrave: the Latin is sg.)

94—5 *and doth thence affright
Cities, and Townes of most conspicuous site ;*

and the great towns afraies

et magnas territat urbes,

96—7 *As couetous she is of Tales, and Lies,
As prodigall of Truth: This Monster &c.*

As mindefull of yll and lyes as blasing truth.
This monster

tam ficti pravique tenax quam nuntia veri.

(Jonson has sharpened the antithesis by adding that of couetous : prodigall to Lies : Truth.)

*

It is true that Jonson produced *Poetaster* in a hurry, but we should not conclude that this was why he utilised Surrey's version of Virgil's passage on rumour. He may well have had his couplet translation on hand, as he apparently had the translation of the Ovid elegy in Act I Scene ii.

Nor does the question of plagiarism arise: on the contrary, Surrey's translation was so well known that it is more likely that Jonson made his version deliberately reminiscent of it in order to stress his point: that heroic couplets were superior to blank verse for Virgil translation, and perhaps for all translation of hexameters. Commentators have decried Jonson's effort ever since Gifford. It is hard to see why they have found it so clumsy: fair comparison is rather with Surrey himself, Stanyhurst and Phaer, than with Dryden. The couplets are sometimes padded to make them run out — e.g. lines 67, 32-3, 87, and 95; but in several places Jonson has got far more out of the Latin than Surrey — line 57 *nimbus*, 58 *comites* and *passim*, 59 *Dardanius*, 60 *diversa ... tecta* and *agros*, 61 *ruunt*, 63 *deveniunt*, 79 *ingreditur*, 84 *pernicibus*, 88 *tot linguae*; and here and there, as pointed out above, he has added the elegance of antithesis.

Sometimes Jonson followed Tottel's printed version; this is clear from such lines as 57 and 62; at others he must have had before him the Hargrave version, e.g. lines 76, 79, 83, 92 and 93. No printed edition of this latter is known, so it is possible that Jonson had access either to MS Hargrave 205⁶ or to another MS representing that version, or to an unknown version incorporating elements of both Tottel and Hargrave. He did not use Day⁷, as a glance at Padelford's list of readings from Day shows⁸.

Lund.

A. H. KING.

A Rejoinder

Professor Zandvoort's review in this periodical (23, p. 44 ff.) of the fifth volume of my *Grammar* besides some unstinted praise and some detailed observations, for which I am also grateful — for I am not too old to learn, even from criticism of my own work — contains some remarks of a more general character on the fundamental principles of linguistics, on which I should like to say something.

He says that *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* is a contradiction in terms. How is that? I should see nothing unnatural or illogical in a book on the constitution of any country dealing with it as the outcome or result of its political history during the last century or so, or in an account of social conditions on similar lines. Why should it be otherwise in the world of language? Is the great Oxford Dictionary "on Historical Principles" based on a fundamental error? I think not, and I persist in thinking that the program contained in the title of another book of mine, *Growth and Structure*, is still justifiable.

⁶ Padelford concludes that this is an early Elizabethan MS (p. 239).

⁷ Day, John, *The Fourth Booke of Virgil! ... drawne into a strange metre by Henrye, late Earle of Surrey, (?) 1554.*

⁸ p. 205.

When my critic says that what he is pleased to call the 'metaphysic' of my work was already obsolescent when the first part of the *Syntax* appeared and has since become all but obsolete, he probably refers to Saussure's distinction of synchronic and diachronic (from 1916, two years after my vol. II). Saussure created new and, as the sequel proved, successful names for a distinction which had been known long before his *Cours*. But I am not the only one to think that a really scientific study of language should take both sides into consideration. But let us by all means keep the distinction in mind.

Now this is what I am accused of not doing. Professor Z. mentions the following points in which I have not kept the various chronological strata apart.

1. "In order to their deliverance" (7.5₁), found, e.g., in McCarthy and Ruskin, but not mentioned as now unusual. But Z. is bound to admit that in 16.4₄ the construction is said to be formerly frequent.

2. "*Had best* is now far less usual than *had better*" (12.4₁). But my concern in this paragraph was exclusively with the use or non-use of *to*. In vol. IV 9.4, where the construction is treated more fully, I give an example of *had best* from so recent an author as Hugh Walpole, so that it would certainly be premature to stamp it as obsolete.

3. In 7.6₂ it is not said that Walton's construction is obsolete. This should probably have been done, but on the other hand I have in 18.8₁ closely similar examples from recent times.

4. In 21.6₄ the only quotation to show that *will* after *if* always denotes volition is from the Authorized Version. But this is here mentioned only incidentally; its proper treatment belongs in vol. IV, where a full page is given to it with many later quotations (15.9). There was no occasion to repeat this in vol. V, but note the word "always".

5. In 7.1₁ *deceit* and *thought* are mentioned as derived with the ending *-t*. But isn't that correct? It was not my business in this volume to deal with suffixes as such; that belongs in the volume on Morphology. Here I am concerned with the syntactical use of nexus-substantives, and in that respect the words mentioned follow suit.

6. The writer even goes outside the volume under review and blames me for in *Anal. Synt.*, p. 26, having analyzed *Sunday* as belonging to the ordinary type of compounds like *bedroom*. But how else should I analyze it? The pronunciation [sandeɪ] still exists, and even those people who always say [sandi] certainly still feel the word as a compound. The case of *holiday* is perhaps a little different.

Altogether the net result of all these efforts seems a little meagre. But I have no doubt that further diligent search will reveal other instances in which I have not expressly marked a usage or a quotation as obsolete or archaic.

My critic further says that I have not always kept descriptive and normative grammar apart. My excuse lies in the nature of the subject itself, for grammar, even descriptive grammar, deals with the norms of usage.

When we say that the plural of *mouse* is *mice*, this amounts to saying that any other way of forming the plural would be wrong. How difficult it is to exclude the normative point of view is shown by my critic himself, who says that the "social status" of *listen to* is superior to that of *look at*, and — even more clearly — that "say for you all to go" is distinctly substandard.

I leave the reader to judge whether such objections as these seriously affect the value of my work as a whole.

Lundehave, Helsingør.

OTTO JESPERSEN.

Pour discuter il faut être d'accord. I agree with Professor Jespersen that a really scientific study of language should take both sides (the historical and the non-historical) into consideration. I submit, however, that to do full justice to either, they should be dealt with separately. The Oxford Dictionary, which Professor J. appeals to, is a case in point. Few will maintain that it gives an adequate picture of late nineteenth and early twentieth century English,¹ whatever its merits from a historical point of view. Of course, as with Jespersen's Grammar, one is only too grateful for what it does give.

I still doubt that, to a speaker of modern English, words like *deceit* and *thought* are derived with the ending *-t*. From a 20 c. point of view their relation to *deceive* and *think* is different from that of *development* to *develop*, or of *discovery* to *discover*, to take two other items from the list in 7.11. Synchronically, *deceit* and *thought* are unanalysable — like *Sunday* and *holiday*. Does any unsophisticated Englishman, even if he should say [sandeɪ] (a pronunciation which Jones, for one, does not mention), think of the word as meaning 'day of the sun'? And what about Monday, Tuesday, etc.?

I am not aware that in calling a certain construction sub-standard, I have lapsed into normative instead of descriptive grammar — that would have been the case if I had said 'unnatural' or 'inexcusable'. What I tried to show in my review is that Professor Jespersen sometimes gives up the rôle of the dispassionate student of language, whose business is with what is common or less common, standard or sub-standard, traditional or in living use, and similar distinctions, for that of the teacher of English, who is concerned with (and for) what is 'correct' or otherwise. "When we say that the plural of *mouse* is *mice*, this amounts to saying that any other way of forming the plural would be wrong." I should prefer to say that any other way of forming the plural of this word is non-existent. — Z.

¹ This seems to have been realized in Oxford itself, to judge from the announcement of an ('unconcise') *Oxford Dictionary of Modern English* (see *E. S.*, 1940, p. 30).

Reviews

The Old Germanic Principles of Name-giving. By HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF. xii + 299 pp. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. \$4.

The general principles of Old Germanic name-giving are fairly well known, but the subject offers many problems that need clearing up. It is not to be expected that the treatise here under review should give a final solution of all the intricate problems involved, and its author only expresses the hope that it sheds light on certain hitherto darkened aspects of Germanic life. But there can be no doubt that it is a contribution to the subject of no small value, even though it gives rise to not a few critical remarks.

The author is well versed in the earlier literature on the subject, and a considerable number of sources have been consulted for the collection of material. I do not think many important items could be added to the Bibliography, but I miss at least two. Among sources I miss *Saints of England* (best ed. Liebermann, *Die Heiligen Englands*, 1889), especially valuable for the Kentish genealogy. Its name-forms are superior to those of Florence of Worcester (FW). Thus all the MSS of Saints have *Merwal* (dat. *Merwale*) as the name of Eormenburg Domneva's Mercian husband instead of *Mereweald* (FW); evidently the correct form of the name is *Merewealh*. *Domneva* is *Domne Eue* (*Domna-Eva*) in Saints, and Liebermann remarks that *Domne* (*Domina*) here means "nun" or rather "abbess". I likewise miss Gustav Storm's article *Vore Forfædres Tro på Sjælevandring og deres Opkaldelsessystem* (Arkiv f. nord. Filol. ix, pp. 199-222), an article equally important for its material and its discussion of matters of principle. Had Mr. Woolf known it, he could hardly have been uninfluenced by it. Incidentally he would hardly have made Skule a son of Tostig (p. 136).

The chief part of the book is devoted to Anglo-Saxon name-giving (chap. II-XI, pp. 8-161). The available material is fully, even if not exhaustively, booked, and the whole OE period is included. The chapters on Scandinavians, Merovingians etc. are brief and limit themselves to the earliest period. The Merovingian genealogy is carried down only to c. 700. In this review I shall chiefly discuss the Old English sections.

For obvious reasons the OE royal families get the lion's share of space, but the names of non-royal families are fully dealt with also. For the pedigrees of the royal families the author has been able to draw on earlier collections, especially Searle, *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings and Nobles*, and this debt is handsomely acknowledged. Indeed his lists do not contain much material beyond that given by Searle, whose forms and dates he largely adopts. But as Mr. Woolf tells us (p. 5) that each genealogy has been drawn inductively from the original sources, I have no doubt he has regularly consulted the sources himself. On the other hand the chapter on non-royal families is far more independent than those on royal families.

The greater part of the material here booked has apparently been collected for the first time from the original sources by the author. This material is very welcome and valuable.

The chief problems that interest the author are the proportion of dithematic and monothematic names, the use of alliteration and of variation in name-giving, the repetition of names, and the share of the mother in naming children. The question of by-names is incidentally touched on. All these questions are fully and ably discussed, and in the final chapter the results are briefly summed up. Naturally very definite results cannot always be reached. The material is partly defective and unreliable or at least doubtful. Yet it must be admitted that Mr. Woolf's book really throws new light on the various problems.

The chief objection that can be raised against the book is the fact that the method is not always strict enough, and that the author's attitude towards his material is not sufficiently critical. The sources are of varying value. Some are late and of doubtful authority. A distinction is not made between first-rate and second-rate sources. The statements of authorities are sometimes conflicting. It cannot be said that a serious attempt is made to lay a new and firm basis for the study of Old English name-giving. The author is generally content to adopt the results of his predecessors, especially Searle, but on the whole Searle seems to me to be rather more critical than the author.

We are told on p. 5, that "an exact reference is given for each individual named", but this is not quite exact, for sometimes the reference is to such a work as Dict. of Christian Biography (DCB) or Dict. of Nat. Biography (DNB), occasionally to sources of very doubtful authority. Thus p. 28 king Hlothhere of Kent (d. 685) is given a son called Richard, the authority being Alford, *Fides Regia* (1663), and this Richard, who appears to have been a monk at Lucca, gets the three children Willibald (the Traveller), Wunebald (a Continental abbot) and Walpurga (a Continental abbess), the authority being a local antiquary, Thomas Kerslake (d. 1891). It is clear that this genealogy is a fabrication. Mr. Woolf hints that this may be so (p. 31, foot-note), yet he adopts it in his pedigree and draws attention to the variation *Richard: Rricula* and the alliteration in the names *Willibald* etc. in discussing the principles of Kentish name-giving. — Under Essex (p. 18) three Sigebeorhts are mentioned, the first supposed to have been a son of Sæbeorht, and a reference is given to Bede, HE III, 22. But neither Bede nor any other early authority names this Sigebeorht, who appears to be first mentioned by the untrustworthy 15th century chronicler Johannes Brompton. — Among the children of Eadweard I (p. 75) is mentioned one Gregory, the reference being DNB, where we read: "he is said to have had a son called Gregory, who went to Rome, became a monk, and afterwards abbot of Einsiedeln." Such a statement should be verified before it is adopted. Presumably Gregory is a legendary figure. — On p. 27 one Eadburg is made daughter of Æthelbeorht of Kent; the authority is again DNB. This Eadburg, who was abbess of Lyminge, is mentioned

BCS 317 and in Saints, but there is no hint that she was of royal birth. — In the Bernician genealogy the author gives Ida no less than 17 sons, chiefly on the authority of FW. I do not deny that Ida may have had 17 sons, but it is unlikely that the names of all should have been remembered, as Ida lived in the sixth century. FW gives different numbers of sons in his Chronicle and in his Genealogy. The only sons of Ida that seem to be sufficiently authenticated are those mentioned in the early genealogy (Sweet, OET, p. 170), *Eðilric*, *Ocg* and *Edric*. — *Æthelred*, son of *Oswulf* (p. 56), is not mentioned by Searle. This *Æthelred* is stated to have flourished 790-794. But the *Æthelred* who reigned from 790 to 794 was son of *Moll Æthelweald*, as definitely stated in the Old English Chronicle.

Sometimes Mr. Woolf prefers later and inferior sources to older ones. Thus p. 18, on the authority of FW, he makes *Swithhelm* the son of *Sigebeald*, though *Bede* states that his father was *Sexbald*. I should hesitate to reject a statement of *Bede's* concerning a king who lived shortly before his own time. At any rate we are not justified in identifying *Bede's* *Sexbald* with the *Seaxa* who lived some generations before *Swithhelm*. — *Ebusa* is given as the son of *Ohta* (p. 27), though *Nennius* says he was the son of *Horsa* and a nephew of *Ohta*. Mr. Woolf gives as his authority *William of Malmesbury*, whose statement he seems to have misunderstood: (*Hengest sent*) *fratrem Ohtam and filium Ebusan*.

The author may object that a few inaccuracies and doubtful identifications do not materially affect the general results, and this may be so, but sometimes the material is very scanty, and each example must be carefully scanned. A typical instance will be given later on.

Names are mostly given in a normalized West Saxon form. Personally I object to *Aldfrith* and *Alhfrith* kings of Bernicia being called *Ealdfrith* and *Ealhfrith*, but such spellings do no harm. However, it is not always easy to normalize a spelling, and some of Mr. Woolf's forms are open to criticism. *Tytila* (p. 9) has no authority; only *Tyttla* and *Tytil* are recorded. — *Iurwine* (ib.) appears to be a normalized form taken from DCB; *William of Malmesbury* has *Germinus*, Lib. El. *Jurminus*. Very likely the correct form was *Iurmin* (whence later *Eormen*). — *Æthelburg* daughter of *Anna* (ib.) is *Aedilberg* in *Bede*. Also *Æthelburg Tate* (p. 27) is *Ædilberg* in the best MSS of *Bede*. The correct form of the name is *Æthelbeorg*; OE *-burg* and *-beorg* were not identical. *Eormenburg Domneva* (p. 27) is *Eormenbeorg* in the earliest MS of *Saints*, while her sister is *Eormenburg*. The two sisters did not have the same name. — *Bede's* *Alric* cannot be normalized to *Ælric* (p. 28). — Incidentally I remark that the author sometimes prefers a later form to an older one. Thus a supposed son of *Ida* is called *Clappa* (p. 54), the form of FW, though the early List of Kings (Sweet, OET, p. 148), a first-rate authority, has *Glappa*. — *Cuthwealh* (p. 42) is based on FW's form. The ancient genealogy in Sweet, OET, p. 170, has *Cundwalh*.

Women's names in OE *-e* are sometimes Latinized to *-a*, which is a

common OE masculine ending. This may be misleading. Thus p. 43 *Tibba* turns out to be a lady. On p. 99 occur the men's names *Leppa*, *Ridda*, *Headda*, *Bosa*, *Cussa*, the women's names *Beage*, *Dunna*, *Bugga*; the sex is not mentioned. In BCS 156 the last two names occur in the forms *Dunne* (nom.), *Bucgan* (obl.).

The dates might have been more exact and careful. Very commonly a statement such as "fl. ca. 730 or "fl. 901-923" is given. When the year of birth or death of a person is known it should have been regularly mentioned. It is misleading to say that Eadmund Ironside flourished ca. 1016 and to give OEC 1057 as reference, when his death is mentioned OEC 1016. Ecgfrith of Mercia, who died in 796, is stated to have flourished 796. There are a good many such instances. Æthelfled, Lady of the Mercians ("fl. ca. 880"), died in 922 according to OEC (A). She cannot have been born much before 870, if Alfred the Great, her father, was born in 848 or 849. Wrong dates are given (p. 99) for Dunna ("ca. 736"), Bugga ("ca. 736"), and Hrothwaru ("ca. 750"). Hrothwaru was abbess ca. 736, her mother Bugga and grandmother Dunna are mentioned in BCS 156 (ca. 736), but Dunna must have flourished about 680.

Some non-English individuals are included in OE genealogies, presumably by mistake. Ægilbert and his nephew Hlothhere (p. 97) were Franks; in Bede they are called *Agilberctus*, *natione . . Gallus* and *Leutherius*. Harold and his son Yric (p. 107) are the Norwegian kings Harald Fair-hair and Eirik Blood-axe. The family-group Sihtric, Niel, Guthferth, Anlaf (p. 108) was Scandinavian or Irish-Scandinavian. The Scandinavian genealogies in Beowulf belong to chap. XII (Scandinavians).

On p. 133 we find the genealogy Franco-Reingwald-Riggulf-Ethric-(Daughter)-Alchmund-Elfred, which, we are told, reveals "the gradual replacement of Scandinavian by English names, a trend that is hardly to be expected." Incidentally, this trend is common. But I find no Scandinavian names in the genealogy. Franco is OE *Franca*. Franco was one of those who carried St. Cuthbert's remains ab. 880; he would not be a Scandinavian. Reingwald is OE *Regenwald*. Riggulf is doubtful, possibly OE *Hringwulf*.

Under Scandinavians I note that the author has misunderstood the name-forms *Hrorer* and *Haeruwulafir* (p. 163 f). They are patronymics and mean 'son of *Hrorar* (*Haeruwulafir*)'. *Hrorar* *Hrorer* means 'Hrorar son of *Hrorar*' and thus gives a very early example of repetition of the father's name.

I submit that the unique *Corbus* in the Merovingian genealogy (p. 184) is a Latinized form of *Chramn*. Raven is Lat. *corvus*; *b* for *v* is sometimes found in OHG loanwords from Latin, as OHG *Perna*, MHG *Berne* from *Verona*, OHG *Rabana* from *Ravenna*.

The interesting question of name-repetition by parent and child is dealt with in various places, especially p. 255 ff. Old English cases are few: three eighth-century, two ninth-century, and ten eleventh-century ones being collected. But a careful examination shows that the three earliest examples

are highly doubtful. Saxulf-Saxulf comes from a very poor source (Ingulph's Chron., which is now taken to be a forgery). Sigehere-Sige here BCS 280 f. really appears in both texts as *Sighere filius Sig.* Nothing shows that *Sig.* is abbreviated from *Sigheri*. BCS 280 also mentions *Sigricus dux*. Algar-Algar is taken from BCS 331, a late transcript, where *Algar* may equally well represent OE *Ælfgar*, *Ealdgar*, *Ealhgar*, *Æðelgar*. Of the two ninth-century examples, *Ælfgar-Ælfgar* is ostensibly given on the authority of Freeman's *Norman Conquest*. But Freeman quotes the genealogy from a late MS printed in Mon, and points out that it is unreliable. Eardwulf-Eardwulf c. 800 are Eardwulf king of Bernicia (795-806) and his father who is said to have been also called Eardwulf. The only authority for this seems to be Symeon of Durham, rather a late source.

Later examples are of course indubitable. But it is noteworthy that Eadmund Ironside died in 1016 and that his son Eadmund is supposed to have been born in the same year. If he was born after his father's death, we might here have a case of naming a son after his deceased father, a practice common in Scandinavia (cf. Storm, *op. cit.*). Nest and her daughter Nest were Welsh. Some of the cases of repetition really belong to the very late eleventh or even the twelfth century (Judith-Judith, Matilda-Matilda, Simon-Simon).

Mr. Woolf does not go into questions of etymology, and this was justifiable, though there are cases where the derivation of names may be of importance. I will end up this review with an etymological suggestion which I have long had in mind. In the Kentish genealogy Hengest's son Oeric has the surname Oesc (Oisc), whence was derived Oiscingas, the name of the royal family. Much has been written on these names; see e.g. Ström, *OE Personal Names in Bede's History*, pp. 29 f., 73 f. I would suggest that Hengest's son was called Oesic (Oisic), from which was formed the patronymic Oescingas (Oiscingas), the medial *i* being regularly dropped in the derivative. Eventually Oesic was misread as Oeric, OE *s* and *r* being liable to confusion. On the other hand an eponym Oesc was deduced from Oescingas. There were thus two names of the ancestor of the family, and one (Oesc) came to be looked upon as a surname.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

Die Körperpflege der Angelsachsen. Eine kulturgeschichtlich-etymologische Untersuchung. Von W. GRAMM. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 86.) Pp. 137. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1938. Price RM. 7.—.

Information about the outward appearance of the Anglo-Saxons and their means of cultivating the body lies scattered in various works of reference covering the entire Germanic field (such as, e.g., Hoops' *Reallexikon*). The consulting of these works strictly with regard to the Anglo-Saxon habits is a laborious task and, besides, they are often not so easily obtainable. In collecting his material Dr. Gramm has limited himself to the Anglo-Saxons. All the references in the texts, both in prose and in poetry, to the treatment of face, hair, beard, teeth, hands, feet, as well as to bathing and physical exercises are grouped together under various sections in the first part of the book, while in the opening sections the author discusses the corporal ideal of the Anglo-Saxons and their methods of preserving a beautiful body. The book is divided into two Parts, the first dealing with the subject from the point of view of the history of civilization, the second offering a linguistic examination of all the words connected with the subject.

There can be no doubt that the author has succeeded best in Part I, which is really most interesting. Especially the section on bathing (pp. 21-31) is worth reading. With the addition of the Latin words and sources (Part II B, pp. 121-126) this part of the book is very useful indeed. I can, however, see no justification for Part II, which deals with the linguistic side of the subject. Under the same headings as in Part I the Anglo-Saxon words of each section are grouped together alphabetically and the form, meaning, occurrences and etymology of each word are given in full. Now the forms, meanings and occurrences of these words are given, sometimes more extensively, in Bosworth-Toller. Thus more examples of *beard* can be found in B.-T. Su., which also gives the plural *beardas* as used of a single person with the meaning "beard and whiskers" (Greg. *Dial.* 279.10). Here, too, more examples are given of the use of *nægel-seax*. And why give the full etymology of these words? One would almost gain the impression that the book is meant as a useful handbook for students, but that the scientific standard of the series of which it forms part 86 is far too high for that. There are no short cuts to knowledge: anyone that has to deal with these words will have to consult the same etymological dictionaries from which Gramm culled his lists of etymologies. Thus, with due appreciation of the valuable and useful work carried out by the author in Part I, I cannot see the justification of Part II, which, for one group of students, gives far too little, for another, far too much.

Even as it is, the value of Part I would have been greater if references had been given to an excellent book by a countryman of the author's: R. Much, *Die Germania des Tacitus* (Heidelberg 1937). Many issues discussed by Gramm with a view to the Anglo-Saxons are dealt with by Much from the Germanic point of view. Thus, e.g., Much's discussion of *Germania* c. 22 makes Gramm's remarks (p. 10 and note 21) superfluous.

This also applies to the question of the origin of soap, ags. *sāp(e)*, Gramm p. 23 and note 3), where it would have sufficed to refer to Much p. 214. Nobody dealing with Tacitus' *Germania* or with Germanic customs can afford to neglect Much's extremely able edition of that text with his commentary. Similarly reference might have been made to *Founders of England*, by Gummere (1930; a reissue of *Germanic Origins* with additional notes and up-to-date bibliography by F. P. Magoun Jr.). In Chapter III, *Men and Women*, Gummere deals with the same subject as Gramm, only less in details, more in a descriptive way.

Wageningen.

B. J. TIMMER.

The Hamlet of Shakespeare's Audience. By JOHN DRAPER.
254 pp. Duke University Press. 1938. \$3.00.

A proper study of Shakespeare's play must include a thorough discussion of the sub-major and minor characters, and it must view the Prince as an Elizabethan. To these two theses we owe an excellent book, the principal features of which are a series of monographs on Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, Horatio, Polonius, Claudius and the rest, all set in the surroundings of an Elizabethan court, and a new interpretation of the rôle and character of Hamlet. Rosencrantz is described as a merry young student of the university, Guildenstern as a budding diplomat, Horatio as a poor student of rather good family, at first hardly known to Prince Hamlet, but when times grow sterner his one supporter and confidant. The dignity of the Polonius family is well set forth, Ophelia is not misrepresented as a weak and foolish girl, as she so often is, but as the normal type of an Elizabethan girl of high lineage. The King is no longer the heavy villain of the piece, but a very efficient ruler and crafty diplomat worthy to be the opponent of Hamlet. Queen Gertrude is freed of the accusations of adultery, murder and usurpation which critics have at times brought against her, and even her "incest" is placed in a kindlier light as a political marriage in the interest of the state and the dynasty. Readers and critics have too often allowed themselves to be influenced by Hamlet's opprobrious epithets for many of these characters. Shakespeare did not compose his play for the study but for the theatre. His characters therefore had a chance to speak for themselves, and by bearing and gesture to show what they wanted to be taken for. Shakespeare's audience must have recognized in Polonius a worthy aristocrat and prime minister, who served his king loyally and governed his family wisely and lovingly. Young Osric they must have recognized as one of those new courtiers who appeared at the court of James I. who had neither the high birth, nor the charming manners of the old nobility, and tried to make up for it by their foppish outlandish behaviour and proficiency in the new methods of fencing. All these characters are seen in their relations with the principal character and with him make the microcosm of the court. Whether Shakespeare in *Hamlet* depicts "a

microcosm of all society in relation to the state" I venture to doubt, seeing the absence of the citizen class, and the meagre representation of the lower classes. A comparison with Chaucer's pilgrimage will therefore hardly do.

Hamlet is by nature a soldier. He is courteous to the officers on guard, and has the deepest respect for Fortinbras, with whose easier fate his own forms a sad contrast. However much a soldierly young man (for Hamlet is no more than twenty years old) wants to proceed to action against a regicide, the nature of his evidence compels him to gather better proof. Hamlet has nothing of the savage nature of Laertes, but goes warily. He is not going to kill a king, the greatest crime an Elizabethan could conceive of, without better proof than the word of a ghost which may be the devil. He chafes under the restraint, hence his melancholy, which according to Elizabethan ideas is not the cause of inaction but its result. At last the play scene supplies him with this much desired evidence, but this same play scene warns Claudius, who henceforward is on his guard, and begins the counter-action. Hamlet might have killed the king when he was on his knees, it is true, but Hamlet's omission is sufficiently accounted for by the "religious" motives he gives himself. The author might have added that this kind of death, to a man of Hamlet's imagination, would not have been a "bella vendetta". After that to the end of the play, the prince does not get a sufficient opportunity to take his just revenge. Hamlet's so-called delay is, therefore, sufficiently motivated by his conflict with exterior circumstances, and it is not necessary, with Bradley, to assume some inner conflict. The nineteenth-century critics thought that Hamlet was only understood in modern times. But to the Elizabethans this prince was a tragic hero, and a man whose active energy was paralysed by too much thinking or by some sort of nervous shock, would not have fulfilled the ideal of those heroic times. Their melancholy was a thing quite different from what we understand by it. It rather made a man dangerously active. This study of Elizabethan melancholy is one of the many excellent features of the present book.

The subject of the tragedy of *Hamlet* is regicide, and in connection with that the divine right of kings, a topic much discussed about the time of the accession of King James I. At the same time the play represents the struggle of one man with the right on his side against a corrupt world. This man is a young fiery prince forced to inaction by circumstances, who sees his schoolfriends, the girl he had loved, his mother, siding with his enemy, who in consequence is filled with bitterness, who, in order to achieve his task has to resort to the weapons of diplomacy, feigning and devious courses, which as a soldier and gentleman he hates, whose very character in a few months' time deepens from a gay charming student to a bitter righter of wrong, and who, against all opposition achieves his end at the cost of his own life; this was a tragic hero after the heart of the English of the time of Elizabeth, and this — according to Professor Draper — is the true Hamlet.

This English Language. By SIR E. DENISON ROSS, C.I.E., D. Litt., Ph. D. 266 pp. London—New York—Toronto: Longmans Green and Co. 1939. 5/— net.

This English Language is designed to supplement the ordinary text-books on English hitherto compiled for the guidance of students whose mother tongue is not English. It is not a crambook on idiom in the ordinary sense of the word, to be memorized parrot-like, nor is it an uncritical compilation like Brewer's *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*. In the author's words he has "attempted to bring together in one book the most popular anecdotes, allusions and quotations peculiar to the English, that is to say the national background and the stock-in-trade of idiomatic usage common to the majority of Englishmen. This is the kind of knowledge that the composer of The Times crossword puzzles takes for granted in his readers; for these puzzles are largely based on the cultural repertory of those born and bred in the British Isles, whose education has at least reached the standard of the secondary school."

The net is cast very wide, for the contents include Literary Questions (The Bible, The Prayer Book, Hymns, Poetry, Prose, Nursery rhymes), Stock Phrases, and last but not least, a part treating of English Tradition. Under this heading come sections dealing with History, Fictitious Characters, Famous Localities, Festivals, Sports, National Dishes and Famous Advertisements. We have but skirted the fringe of the subjects treated by the author.

The limited extent of the undertaking has necessarily rendered it one of selection; for if all the items of information pertaining to any one of the sections comprised therein were included, they would of themselves have proved sufficient to fill a bulky volume. The principle adopted seems to have been to give only those allusions, phrases, epithets etc. which are most frequently met with.

Without wishing to derogate from the merit of this handy little book we venture to draw the author's attention to a few slips. Page 229: The name of the Dutch admiral should have been given as *Tromp*, not *Van Tromp*.¹ — P. 232: *Santa Claus* is stated to be "originally St. Nicholas, but in England confused with Father Christmas, who fills the stockings which children hang up on Christmas Eve." As a matter of fact Santa Claus is an American corruption of Sante Klaas, one of the best known saints of the early Dutch settlers. See Miss Yonge's *History of Christian Names* I 213: "The Dutch element in New England has introduced Santa Klaus to many a young American who knows nothing of St. Nicholas or of any saint's day." — P. 245: The information given on Gretna Green marriages is misleading. Since 1856 a residential qualification has rendered such run-away marriages illegal. — On page 138 there is a reference to 'a well-known hymn' "Where the wicked cease from troubling, And the weary are at rest."

¹ The mistake is a traditional one, however. — E.d.

No such hymn could be found in any collection of sacred songs, though there is a paraphrase of Job 3.17 in a Scots Hymnal. — The saying "Nothing succeeds like success" (p. 98) is wrongly fathered on Oscar Wilde; the quotation given by the *Oxford English Dictionary* is dated as early as 1868. — The expression *not to care a tinker's dam* (page 212) is incorrectly given: *dam* should be *damn* (N.E.D., i.v. *Tinker*.). — "Cut and dried" (page 173) is defined as 'stereotyped', 'narrow-minded'. This is hardly the meaning the expression bears in "The apparently innocent meeting was a cut and dried appointment" or in "You can't alter these things by any cut and dried plans." "Arranged in advance" would get nearer to the sense the word bears in the two sentences quoted. — "To be in one's cups" = to be intoxicated, or in plain English *drunk*, is a rather bookish expression (p. 173). — Is 'to take French leave' equivalent to "to go without asking permission"? Compare the parallel French locution "*filer à l'anglaise*" (p. 191). — It is explained (on p. 169) that the expression "to bell the cat" derives from a fable. The same remark presumably applies to a "cat's paw," "to pull the chestnuts out of the fire", "a dog in the manger", "a cock and bull tale" (French "*coq-à-l'âne*").

It is to be hoped that the present work will contribute towards the task of spreading a knowledge of English culture and institutions. It should light the way for many puzzled inquirers.

Breda.

P. J. H. O. SCHUT.

Brief Mention

"Herr" und "Frau" und verwandte Begriffe in ihren alt-englischen Aequivalenten. Von HILDEGARD STIBBE. (Anglistische Forschungen herausgegeben von J. Hoops, Heft 80). 105 pp. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1935. RM. 4.50.

This dissertation is not so much a lexicological treatise as a compilation of OE words for "Herr", "Herrin", "Mann", "Frau". There are more OE expressions for "Herr" than for "Herrin", but as many for "Frau" as for "Mann". The author distinguishes words that must have existed already in Primitive Germanic, like "*frēa*", "*cwēn*", and others which are OE coinages, like "*hlāford*", "*hlāfdige*". The word "*eorl*" figures twice, first (p. 36) as a primitive Germanic word meaning "man"; then (p. 67) as an OE coinage meaning "earl", "count". This is, of course, an error. A primitive Germanic word cannot, at the same time, be an OE coinage; but its meaning has, in England, developed in a characteristic way. — Some thirty different words are treated; yet anybody that has at all looked into OE texts will remember words which are not included, e.g., "*ceorl*", "*secg*", for "Mann", "*rinc*", "*beorn*", for "Herr". Then we miss the pluralia tantum: "*ylde*", "*firas*", "*niððas*". Further words in *Beowulf* for "Herr", "Fürst", are "*fengel*", "*bealdor*". Such omissions impair the value of this otherwise useful monograph. — M. S.

Shakespeare. Von P. MEISSNER. (Sammlung Göschen Band 1142.) 115 pp. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1940. Geb. RM. 1,62.

Professor Meissner, who had already contributed to the "Sammlung Göschen" three volumes on the history of English literature from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the present day, has now added an excellent little monograph on Shakespeare. It consists of two parts, one in which the poems and plays are discussed in chronological order, and another which deals with Shakespeare's work as it reflects the tendencies of "Gotik", "Renaissance" and "Barock", and which also treats of Shakespeare's personality and of his influence on posterity in England, Germany and a number of other countries.

The point of view from which Shakespeare's work is analysed naturally differs somewhat from that in most English treatments of the subject. On the whole, more attention is paid to intellectual than to aesthetic values, and the criticism will strike many readers as ideological rather than artistic. There are a few surprising omissions: in the section on *Macbeth* hardly a word is said of Lady Macbeth; Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy* is not included in the bibliographical lists, no more than Tucker Brooke's edition of the Shakespeare Apocrypha, or his book on the Sonnets. There are also a few minor inaccuracies. On the whole, however, the booklet will be found stimulating reading, even if here and there the reader finds himself obliged to dissent. It should reach a wide public, in Germany and elsewhere. -- Z.

Efficiency in Linguistic Change. By OTTO JESPERSEN. (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. XXVII, 4.) 90 pp. København: Einar Munksgaard. 1941. Dan. Cr. 4,50.

This pamphlet contains a retrospect and summary of Jespersen's views on progress in language as more fully set forth in his well-known books on the subject. Jespersen's philosophy is frankly pragmatic and utilitarian: linguistic changes, according to him, "should be measured by the standard of efficiency judged chiefly according to the expenditure of energy, mental and physical, both on the part of the speaker and of the recipient." Of all languages he considers that modern English produces a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort, thereby approaching most nearly to his ideal, though other languages, too, show signs of improvement as compared with their earlier stages. Jespersen's thesis is one on which endless argument is possible; whether one sides with or against it ultimately depends on one's scale of values in regard to language and life.

Not all observations in this pamphlet are equally convincing. Though Jespersen himself hesitates to accept the reason given for the displacement of *son* by *boy* or *lad* in most English dialects, viz. homophony with *sun*, the explanation, is so unlikely that it had better not have been mentioned at all. That we say *left-hand corner* because *left corner* would suggest the verb *to leave*, and that the rarity of the verb *flee* in modern times is due to homophony with *flea*, is equally improbable, not to say absurd. "Transferred applications of the most usual words are inevitable in any language", but the point might have been more happily illustrated than by an artificial sentence like "my new house is an old one, and my old house was a new one." [A similar symptom of a partiality for linguistic conundrums occurs in *MEG* V, 11.18, where it is remarked that the substitution of *loving* for *to love* in "He discovered that to love women might be dangerous" might cause ambiguity.]

On Gill's "Mopsæ" see *E. S.* XVI (1934) 59.

It is one of Jespersen's numerous merits to have collected and systematized a great many instances of what may, from a given point of view, be regarded as improvements in language. Whether these observations form a sufficient basis for an adequate philosophy of language is another matter. — Z.

Vom Englischunterricht. Von F. L. SACK. 32 pp. Bern: Verlag A. Francke AG., n. d., Fr. —.80., (Separatdruck aus der "Schulpraxis" des Bernischen Lehrervereins vom Januar/Februar 1941, Heft Nr. 10/11).

This useful and stimulating booklet is intended to help those teachers of English at secondary schools in Switzerland who may wish to improve their own methods by studying those employed by others. Dr. Sack will be particularly helpful to the young and inexperienced teacher, as his study is less a critical survey of existing methods than a collection of "hints" that will prove valuable in the class-room.

The various sections of the article deal with the teaching of phonetics, grammar, literature, with the questions of home-work, essay-writing, oral exercises and so on. Everywhere Dr. Sack's views are fundamentally sound and up to date. I liked particularly his suggestions how to use an ordinary English primer. I only wish Dr. Sack had multiplied his examples. It is to be hoped that he will give us one day a comprehensive and systematic account of a subject in which he has proved himself such a competent judge. — H. W. H.

Bibliography

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben von W. KELLER. Band 76. v + 266 pp. Weimar: Böhlau. 1940. Price ? [To be reviewed.]

Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642. By F. TH. BOWERS. ix + 288 pp. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press. 1940. Price \$3.—.

Richard Wagner in der englischen Literatur des XIX Jahrhunderts. Von M. MOSER. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 7. Band.) 118 pp. Bern: A. Francke. 1938. Sw. Fr. 5.75. [To be reviewed.]

Martin F. Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind. By R. BUCHMANN. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 10. Band.) 165 pp. Bern: A. Francke. 1941. Sw. Fr. 9.50. [To be reviewed.]

The American Novel, 1789-1939. By C. VAN DOREN. Revised and enlarged edition. 406 pp. New York: Macmillan Cy. 1940. \$3.—.

LANGUAGE

Abriss der Altenglischen (Angelsächsischen) Grammatik. Von E. SIEVERS. Zehnte Auflage, neubearbeitet von K. BRUNNER. (Sammlung Kurzer Grammatiken Germanischer Dialekte, C. Abrisse, Nr. 2.) viii + 80 pp. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer. 1941. Geh. RM. 2.20. [To be reviewed.]

Altenglisches Lesebuch. (Prosa.) Von J. RATH. viii + 164 pp. München: Max Hueber. 1940. Price RM. 3.60. [To be reviewed.]

The C-Text of the Old English Chronicles. By H. A. ROSTITZKE. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, Heft 34.) 100 pp. Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus. 1940. RM. 4.—.

Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache. Von DR. KARL LUICK †. Erster Band. Zweites Kapitel: Die Entwicklung der Konsonanten. Lieferung 12 (Seite 1013-1149). Nach den hinterlassenen Aufzeichnungen ausgearbeitet und herausgegeben von R. WILD und H. KOZIOL. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1940.

Die Lautliche Gestaltung Englischer Ortsnamen im Altfranzösischen und Anglonormannischen. Von F. BESTMANN. (Romanica Helvetica, Vol. IX.) xxxi + 215 pp. Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag. 1938. Sw. Fr. 15.—. [To be reviewed.]

Die Frühzeit der englischen Grammatik. Von O. FUNKE. (Schriften der Literarischen Gesellschaft Bern. IV.) 91 pp. Bern: Herbert Lang & Cie. 1941. Sw. Fr. 7.50. [To be reviewed.]

The Language of Satirized Characters in Poëtaſter. A socio-stylistic analysis 1597-1602. By A. H. KING. (Lund Studies in English. X.) xxxiv + 258 pp. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1941. Price 10 kronor. [To be reviewed.]

A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. By OTTO JESPERSEN. Part V. Syntax. Fourth Volume. xv + 528 pp. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard. 1940. Price Dan. Cr. 20.—. [See Review, April 1941.]

Efficiency in Linguistic Change. By OTTO JESPERSEN. (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser. xxvii, 4.) 90 pp. København, Einar Munksgaard. 1941. Dan. Cr. 4.50. [See Brief Mention.]

Studies on the Syntax of the English Verb. By B. M. CHARLESTON. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 11. Band.) x + 209 pp. Bern: A. Francke. 1941. Sw. Fr. 11.—. [To be reviewed.]

HISTORY

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by DUMAS MALONE. Volume XX. Werden-Zunser. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 52s. 6d. or £47 5s. od. set of Twenty Volumes.

Benjamin Franklin. By CARL VAN DOREN. Putnam. 15s.

The Growth of the American Republic. By S. E. MORISON and H. S. COMMAGER. Revised and enlarged edition in two volumes. Vol. I, 1763-1865. Vol. II, 1865-1937. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. Vol. I, 12s. 6d. Vol. II, 15s., or 25s. the two vols.

The Founding of American Civilization. The Middle Colonies. By TH. J. WERTENBAKER. Scribners. 12s. 6d.

Constitutional History of the United States. By A. C. McLAUGHLIN. Appleton-Century. 1935. 21s.

The American Political System. By D. W. BROGAN. Hamish Hamilton. 1933. 18s.

The Tercentenary of Harvard College. A Chronicle of the Tercentenary Year 1935-1936. Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 17s.

History of the State of New York. Vol. IX. Mind and Spirit. Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 25s.

Middletown. A Study in American Culture. By R. S. LYND and H. M. LYND. Foreword by Clark Wissler. Cheap re-issue. Constable. 10s. 6d.

Middletown in Transition. A Study in Cultural Conflicts. By R. S. LYND and H. M. LYND. Constable. 1937. 18s.

Eiré. Histoire d'Irlande. Par CH.-M. GARNIER. (Collection Montaigne.) 270 pp. Paris: Aubier. 1939. 25 fr.

Irland: Die Insel der Heiligen und Rebellen. Von R. BAUER. 315 pp. Leipzig: Goldmann. 1938. RM. 7.80.

The Victoria History of the Counties of England. A History of Sussex. Vol. IX. The Rape of Hastings. Published for the University of London Institute of Historical Research by the Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 1937. 42s.

The Victoria History of the County of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely. Edited by L. F. SALZMAN. Volume I. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 63s.

The Victoria History of the Counties of England. A History of Northampton. Vol. IV. Published for the University of London Institute of Historical Research by the Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 63s.

London County Council Survey of London. Volume XVIII. *The Strand* (The Parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Part II). By SIR GEORGE GATER and E. P. WHEELER. London County Council. 21s.

London: the Unique City. By S. E. RASMUSSEN. With an Introduction by JAMES BONE. London: Cape. 1937. 15s.

Old Parish Life in London. By C. PENDRILL. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 21s.

Suffolk Churches and their Treasures. By H. MUNRO CAUTLEY. Batsford. 21s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715). With Special Reference to the Reign of Queen Anne. Vol. II, 1708-1715. By W. TH. MORGAN. vi + 684 pp. Bloomington, Indiana. 1937. Price ? [To be reviewed.]

The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. Edited by F. W. BATESON. In Four Volumes. London & New York: Cambridge University Press. 1940.

Seventh Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400. Additions and Modifications to July, 1938. By J. E. WELLS. 1555-1652 pp. London: Milford. 1938. 7s. [See Brief Mention, E. S. XXII, 43-44.]

Introduction to Medieval Literature, chiefly in England. Reading List and Bibliography. By R. S. LOOMIS. 24 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. Paper, 25c.

John Dryden: A Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana. By H. MACDONALD. 372 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1939. 30s.

John Evelyn. A Study in Bibliophily and a Bibliography of his Writings. By GEOFFREY KEYNES. 25 plates, 47 reproductions of title-pages, 2 engravings. Limited edition. Cambridge University Press. £3 3s. net.

A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift, D.D. By H. TEERINK. (Edition limited to 315 copies.) xii + 434 pp. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1937. Price fl. 20.—

The Book in America. By H. LEHMANN-HAUPT in collaboration with R. S. GRANNISS and L. C. WROTH. New York: R. R. Bowker. London: J. Whitaker. 25s.

Theatre Collections in Libraries & Museums. An International Handbook by R. GILDER & G. FREEDLEY. 182 pp. London: Stevens and Brown. 1936. 7s. 6d. net.

The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. XVIII. 1937. Edited for The English Association by F. S. BOAS and M. S. SERJEANTSON. 290 pp. Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d. [See Brief Mention, E. S. XXI, 187.]

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. XVIII. 1937. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by M. S. SERJEANTSON. xi + 311 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1939. 8s. 6d. [See Brief Mention, E. S. XXI, 186.]

Lexicographical and Etymological Notes

Attention has more than once been 'drawn to the importance of early legal and administrative documents for English lexicography. These sources have been frequently had recourse to in the later sections of the New English Dictionary, less often so in its earlier parts. But they have by no means been exploited to the extent they merit. Sir Allen Mawer, in his paper *Some Unworked Sources for English Lexicography*, in *A Grammatical Miscellany offered to Otto Jespersen* (1930), contributed important notes and material illustrating the value of early surnames as a source for the history of the English vocabulary. Later his suggestions were followed up and worked out more in detail for surnames of occupation by my pupil Dr. Gustav Fransson in *Middle English Surnames of Occupation 1100-1350* (Lund Studies in English, III, Lund, 1935) with very important results.

I have lately had occasion to go through a number of early London sources, and in so doing I repeatedly came across English words which deserve attention. Those discussed below are only to a small extent personal appellations. The documents contain many interesting words of other descriptions, as names of weapons or other implements. The documents are in Latin, but many genuinely English words are incidentally quoted in them.

What gives this material special interest and importance is of course the fact that the texts reflect the London language, thus tell us something about the vocabulary of the Standard English in process of development.

The sources that have been used are:

Calendar of Letter-Books ... of the City of London at the Guildhall. Edited by Reginald R. Sharpe, D.C.L., London, 1899 ff. The five earliest of the Letter-Books (Letter-Books A-E) have chiefly been used. (Quoted as Letter-Bk A etc.).

Calendar of Coroners Rolls of the City of London A.D. 1300-1378. Edited by Reginald R. Sharpe, D.C.L. London, 1913. (Quoted as Cor.).

Both these sources give an English translation of the Latin text. The following two give the original Latin text:

Liber Albus and Liber Custumarum. In *Munimenta gildhallæ Londoniensis*. Rolls Series, London 1859-1862. *Liber Albus* was written in 1419, *Liber Custumarum* c. 1320. (Quoted as *Liber Albus* and *Liber Cust.*).

These records often provide earlier examples of words than those in the New English Dictionary (NED), or they supplement the material in the Dictionary in the case of words rarely recorded in Middle English literature proper. Sometimes the fresh material gives important clues to the etymology of words.

The Coroners Rolls, dealing as they do with numerous cases of murder or manslaughter, mention a good many weapons. The names of these are

collected in the Introduction, p. xxiii, though without any etymological discussion. A few may be briefly noted here. NED has one instance of a word *bidowe* 'a weapon of some kind', found in Langland, *P. Pl.* A. xi. 211. Skeat, in his Notes to *P. Pl.*, refers the word to *MLat. bidubium* 'a bill-hook or bush-hook'. It is clear from the context that a dagger or sword is meant (*A bidowe or a baselard he berip be his side*). In Cor., where the word is frequently mentioned, it is explained by *cultellus* (a knife) or once even *cultellus longus et latus*. The word was thus used of a long and broad knife. The form is *bideu* pp. 71 ff. (1323-1325), *bydawe* (*bidawe, bidau*) pp. 179 ff. (1336-1339). Also *baselard* 'a species of dagger or hanger, usually worn at the girdle' (first evidenced in NED from Langland, *P. Pl.*) is found in Cor.: a knife called "baselard" 1337, 1340. — Not in NED is *faggot-staff* 'a pole for carrying faggots of wood'. A faggot-staff was often used as a weapon. It is *fagotstaf*, *fagatstaf* Cor. 1323 ff. — *Misericord* 'a dagger with which the *coup de grâce* was given' is first recorded in NED from the fifteenth century. *Misericord(e)* (a knife called m.) occurs repeatedly in Cor. from 1300 on. — The word *whittle* or *thwittle* 'a knife' is not with certainty recorded in NED till Chaucer (c. 1386). In Cor. *Twytel* (knife called T.) occurs 1322, *twhitel, Thwytel* 1324.

Two names of diseases mentioned in Cor. deserve notice. *Phthisic* (first reference in NED 1340) is *Tisic* (disorder called T.) 1301 (p. 16). *Postume* (infirmity called p.) is found 1338-1339 (p. 210). First example in NED from Chaucer (c. 1374).

Some words denoting various kinds of cloth may be adduced. *Kersey* 'a kind of cloth' (first English example¹ in NED 1390) occurs in a list of cloths of 1315 (*Kerseys* plur.) in Letter-Bk E, p. 54. The list includes cloths called *Heydok* and *Mendeps*, which are not in NED. The latter, I suppose, is cloth from Mendip, Som. The former might possibly be cloth from Haydock in Lancs.

A number of personal appellations deserve mention.

Boater 'a boatman' (1605 ff. NED) is *botere* 1321, 1336 Cor. (pp. 41, 172); Gilbert de Haryngeseye, "botere" 1321, Walter atte Brome, "botere" 1336 (dead at Billingsgate Wharf). — *Buckler-player* 'fencer' (1448 NED) is *boklerplaier* 1339 Cor. (p. 230); William de Norhamptone and Richard de Bulkele, *Boklerplaiers*. — *Philip le Hatlynere* 1325 Cor. (p. 135) provides a word not in NED. *Hatlynere* must mean 'workman who lines hats' and testifies to some degree of specialization in the hatters' trade. — *Meter* 'one who measures; a measurer' (1388 Wiclif in NED) is found as a surname in *Andrew le Metere* 1322 Letter-Bk E (p. 167), mentioned as one of the meters at Queenhithe. *Henry le Metere* is mentioned 1338 Cor. Also *saltmeter* occurs: *Roger de Derby, saltmetere* 1339 Cor. (juror for Queenhithe). — No earlier example of *vagabond* is given in NED than c. 1485, while *vagabond* adj. is recorded from 1426. In Letter-Bk D

¹ But NED quotes a Latinised form of 1262: *pannis cersegis*, abl. of *panni cersegi*.

(1311) we read: "John Blome attached because indicted as a common "wagabund" by night and for committing batteries." The initial *w-* is noteworthy. — The first example of *wharfinger* in NED is from 1552-3. It is suggested that the word is from earlier **wharfager*. Almost exactly this postulated form is recorded in Letter-Bk E 1322 (p. 167), where one of the meters at Billingsgate is called *John le Wharvager*. — *Woolworker* in its genuine early London form appears as *Wollewerchere* 1339-40 Cor. NED has the form *Wolwyrchers* (plur.) from a London will of 1372. William le Wollewerchere was a juror in a case relative to an accident at the Woolwharf in Tower Ward. Other jurors were *Richard le Packedrawere* and *Philip le Wolleberere*. Packdrawers and woolbearers were clearly workmen employed at the woolwharf, but neither is mentioned in NED.

Some of the words noted in the records must be discussed more fully.

1. *Balkstaff* 'a quarterstaff', *ballow* 'a cudgel'.

NED, under *balk* sb. 14, gives an obsolete compound *balk-staff*, rendered 'a quarterstaff', with examples from c. 1400 Beryn (He berith a Bal[k]-staff),² 1664 Cotton, Scarron. (*Balk-Staves and Cudgels*) and 1674 Ray *N. Country Wds.* (*Balkstaff*, a Quarter-staff, a great Staff like a Pole or Beam). The following examples will show that the etymology implied (first element the word *balk*) cannot be correct. At the same time some new light will be thrown on *ballow* 'a cudgel' in Shakespeare's *King Lear*.

In Cor. 1300-1325 mention is frequently made of a staff called *Balstaf*. There are nine examples, all found in Rolls A-D. In Rolls E-H, dating from 1325-6 till 1340, the same weapon is mentioned six times, but it is now called *Balghstaf* or *Balghstaff*, the plural being *-stafs*, *-staffs*, or *-staves*. The last example dates from 1340. It is clear that *Balstaf* is identical with *Balghstaf*, and also with *balkstaff*, as is indeed suggested by the editor of the Rolls. The change from *Balstaf* to *Balghstaf* coincides with a change of Coroner. During the years covered by Rolls B-D the coronership was held by John de Ilford; from 1325-6 on his place was filled by John de Shirbourne, who still held it in 1340. There were evidently two forms of the word, *balstaf* and *balghstaf*, and one Coroner or Coroner's clerk preferred the former, the other the latter form.

The well-evidenced form *balghstaf* shows that the first element of the word is not *balk*, but a word *balgh*. A change of *gh* to *k* before *s* is common at various periods of English, as in *next* from OE *nehst*, *hox* from OE *hohsinu*. An early ME *balghstaf* would tend to become *balkstaf*, unless *gh* disappeared, as in the common form *balstaf*. If the original form was *balkstaf*, we could only explain *balghstaf* as an inverse spelling, but that is ruled out by the regular use of the form in Cor., Rolls E-H. Besides there is a further form of the word, which clinches the matter,

² *Balkstaff* is clearly an emendation of the first editor's. The MS appears to have the form *Balstaf*, the reading given in the latest edition of Beryn (EETS, CV). No emendation is called for.

viz. ballowe staff, quoted in Engl. Dial. Dict. (under *Ballow* sb.) from Nottingham Records 1504: a staff beaked with iron called 'a ballowe staff'. *Ballowe* is a regular development of ME *balgh-*; cf. *tallow* from ME *talgh*. All four forms are thus easily explained from early ME *balghstaf*.

The example last quoted (of 1504) gives an indication of what kind of staff the word denoted or could denote. No description of a *bal(gh)staf* is given in Cor., but several entries indicate that it was a heavy weapon. Thus in the earliest example (of 1300-1) we read that "the said Thomas turned back and struck the said Copin on the left side of the head with a staff called *Balstaf*, inflicting a wound an inch long and two inches deep." The frequent references to the *balstaf* as a weapon of assault also indicate that staves of this kind were very frequently carried in London. The following example from Cor. (p. 115) illustrates this point: "The said Benedict seizing a "balstaf" from a stranger, therewith struck the said Walter on the top of his head so that he fell to the ground" (and died next day).

A fifth form of the word is probably *ballow*, generally rendered by 'cudgel', in Shakespeare's *King Lear* (Ice try whither your Costard or my Ballow be the harder). *Ballow* occurs only in the Folio, while the Quartos have *battero* or *bat*. Dr. Murray in NED is inclined to think the word a corruption. But as Wright, in Engl. Dial. Dict., exemplifies it from Grose (1790) and other sources, its genuineness cannot be doubted. In my *Shakspeare's Vocabulary* (1903) I looked upon it as sufficiently authenticated, and I held it to be related to ME *balgh* adj. 'round, rounded; swelling; smooth', a derivative of OE *belgan* 'to swell'. I also suggested that *ballow* 'a cudgel' is elliptical for *ballow staff*. Both suggestions, at the time they were made, were conjectures, but both have been confirmed by the fresh material collected in this paper. It is clear I was right in deriving *ballow* from ME *balgh*. On the other hand the material strongly suggests that *ballow* is elliptical. The longer form *balghstaf* (*bal-*, *balkstaf*) turns out to be well evidenced from the year 1300 on, while *ballow* is first found in Shakespeare.

The meaning of *balghstaf* appears to have been 'a quarterstaff' (i.e. 'a stout pole, from six to eight feet long and tipped with iron') or 'a cudgel'. What was the original meaning we do not know. All we can say definitely, therefore, is that *balgh-* is connected with the ME adj. *balgh*. But it need not be the adjective itself; it might be an unrecorded substantive **balgh* (OE **balg*) corresponding to the ODan **balgr* 'a swelling of the ground' which is the chief source of the element *-balle* often found in Danish place-names. See e.g. *Dansk Ordbog*, under V. *Balle*, and my article in *Meijerbergs Arkiv*, III, p. 31. The original sense of ODan *balgr* was doubtless 'a swelling', whence naturally developed special senses such as 'elevation of the ground, hillock, mound' and 'knob, protuberance'. It is quite possible that *balgh* in *balghstaf* meant 'a knob', and the compound word 'a stick with a knob' or 'a stick with natural knobs, a cudgel'. Further than that we can hardly get at present.

A noun *ballow* may also occur in the compound *ballowe wood*, only recorded in Nottingham Records 1621 (Engl. Dial. Dict.): *kyddes and ballowe wood*. As *kyddes* means 'faggots', it is clear that *ballowe wood* refers to some kind of firewood. A meaning 'log' or 'billet' may well be postulated for *ballow* here, but some special technical meaning may be thought of.

An element *balgh-* is well evidenced in place-names. Reference may be made to my *Place-names of Lancashire*, p. 7, *Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Balham, Balshaw etc.), and also the article in *Meijerberg's Arkiv* III just quoted. I assume the adj. *balgh* as the first element of these names, but in view of *ballow wood* 'firewood' it may also be suggested that Balshaw and Boscar (earlier *Balghschaghe* and the like) contain **balgh* in some such sense as 'log'. If so, we may compare names like Timberland (originally *-lund* 'grove'), Timperleigh, Timsbury, which mean 'wood or copse where timber was got'.

2. ME *hethereve*, *huthereve* 'reeve of a harbour.'

This word, which would correspond to a Mod. Engl. *hithe-reeve*, is not found in NED, but it must have been used of an official who supervised the port of Queenhithe in London. It occurs repeatedly as a surname or appellation, the earliest instance found being *Walter le Hechereve* (for *Hethereve*) 1302 Letter-Bk C. The same person is called *Walter le Huthereve* (in the margin *Waltero le Huthereve Ripa Regine*) 1308 ib. In 1310 *Walter le Hethereve* and *Robert le Hethereve* were elected and sworn to keep the port of Queenhithe (Letter-Bk D).

Robert le Huthereve, clearly the same as *Robert le Hethereve*, is mentioned 1316 Letter-Bk D, 1321 f. Cor., 1322 Letter-Bk E (in this last case as one of the meters at Queenhithe). The misspelling (Robert le) *Hutherne* occurs 1320 Letter-Bk E. The same person is also called *Robertus le Huchereve* (for *Huthereve*), *bladarius* in an Appendix to *Liber Albus* (p. 413), the date being 1319 or 1320. This example shows that the hithe-reeve was an ordinary citizen who carried on his trade alongside of his reeveship. *Bladarius* means 'cornmonger'.

The Glossary of *Liber Albus* explains *huchereve* as "the name given to an inferior officer whose duty it was to examine the hutches, or boxes, in which the bakers exposed their bread for sale." But it is clear that the word represents an OE *hyð-gerefa* 'reeve of a hithe', or rather 'reeve of Queenhithe'. I have found no reference to a hithe-reeve in connection with any other port than Queenhithe.

The spelling *Hethereve* represents the East Saxon and early London form, with *e* from OE *y*.

3. ME, early Mod. *talshide*, *talwood*.

Talshide is rendered in NED by 'A shide or piece of wood of prescribed length ..., for cutting into billets for firewood'. The first example dates from 1444-5 (*Talschides*); other instances are *Talshides* 1447-8, *taleshyde*

1502 etc. *Talwood* means 'wood for fuel, cut up to a prescribed length.' The earliest examples in NED, apart from one of 1268- cited in Rogers, *Agric. & Prices*, are *Talwode* 1350, 1440, *Taleghwode* 1373, *tallowood* 1497, *Talewod* 1502. *Talwood* is supposed in NED to be a translation of OF *bois de tail* 'bois en coupe' (Godefroi), from *tail* 'cutting, cut'. *Talshide* is similarly held to be a compound of OF *tail* and Engl. *shade*. These etymologies look convincing at first sight, but I do not think they can be allowed to stand.

The very fact that there is not one early example showing a form such as *tail-*, *tayl-* instead of *tal-* causes reflection. There are after all a good many examples of the words. Besides, the early forms *taleghwode* and *tallowood* are remarkable. To these spellings can now be added an earlier one for *talshide*, viz. *talwhschide* (a piece of wood called "talwhschide") 1300 Cor., p. 10, and the remarkably late form *talgwood* quoted from Stat. 34 & 35 Henry VIII in the glossary of *Liber Albus*. It appears we have to start from early ME forms such as *talghschide*, *talghwode*, not from *tailschide*, *-wode*. An element *talgh-* cannot be explained from OF *tail*, which belongs to OF *taillier* from Lat. *taliare*, but it can be accounted for without serious difficulty in a different way.

In Scandinavian languages a base *talg-* is very well evidenced, especially in the weak verb found as ON *telgia*, OSwed *tælghia*, Swed *tälja* 'to hew wood or stone with adze or knife, to shape', from **talgian-*. The non-mutated form *talg-* is preserved in ON *talga* vb., identical in meaning with *telgia*, in ON *talga* sb. 'cutting', the Swedish place-name *Talga* (OSwed *Talghum*), which contains an unrecorded *talg-* in some such sense as 'ravine, gorge' (lit. 'cutting'). The same base is also found as the first element of such words as ON *talgøx*, *tølguøx* 'chip-axe, adze', *tølguknifr* 'jack-knife', *tølgutól* 'implement for cutting or carving', etc. There is also the Swedish place-name *Tälje* (OSwed *Tælghiar*), which presupposes an OSwed noun with *i*-mutation and with the same meaning as that found in the *Talga* just mentioned. For further information on the word-group reference may be made to Hellquist, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, and Torp, *Nynorsk etymologisk ordbok*.

I have no doubt but that ME *talgh-* in *talghschide* etc. is identical with ON *talga* and *talg-* in *talgøx*, the meanings of the English compounds being exactly the same as those suggested in NED, though the derivation is different. From a formal point of view the new derivation suggested is unexceptionable. *Talgh-* presupposes an OE **talg* or ON *talg-*. It corresponds exactly to ON *talg-* in *talgøx*; only the meaning is passive in the English words: (wood) 'to be cut, for cutting', while *talgøx* is 'an axe to cut with'.

But there is a slight discrepancy in sense between the English and the Scandinavian words. Scandinavian *telgia* is in historic times used only in special senses such as 'to whittle, chip, shape'. But the original meaning was doubtless 'to cut' generally, or 'to cleave, split'. Such a sense is presupposed by the words for 'ravine' preserved in Swedish place-names.

And the stem *talg-* belongs to the root *del-* (*delgh-*) 'to cleave, split' found in OIr *dlongid* 'cleaves', *dluige* 'cleaving' etc. See Walde-Pokorny, I, 809 ff.

The stem *talg-* is only recorded in Scandinavian languages. ME *telwin* (*telwhin*) 'to thwite or whittle', found only in *Promptorium Parvulorum*, is a Scandinavian loan-word. But Old English has a number of words containing a root-form *telg-*, related by Ablaut to *talg-*, viz. *telga* 'a branch, bough', *telge* 'a rod', *telgor*, *telgra* 'a plant, shoot, twig'; cf. OHG *zelga*, ON *tialga* 'a twig'. It is thus possible that Old English also had the Ablaut variant *talg-*, so that ME *talgh-* is native, but the probability seems to me to be that ME *talgh-* is of Scandinavian origin.

4. ME, early Mod *trink* 'a kind of net'.

A *trink*, according to NED, was "a kind of fixed fishing-net formerly used in the Thames and other rivers." The form of the word in the earliest examples, according to NED, is *Treinekys* 1311 Liber Horn, *Treinkes* 1344 Letter-Bk F, *Trynks* 1376 Rolls of Parlt., *Trymkes* 1423 Acts Hen. VI, *Trenkes* 1485 Letter-Bk L, *trungkes* 1556 Chron. Gr. Friars. In all the examples the word is in the plural.

To the examples given many more can be added, e.g. *Treinkys* Letter-Bk A, *Treinkes* 1385-6, 1395-6 ib. H, 1421 ib. K, *treinekes* early 14th cent. Liber Cust. 117, *trimkos* ("the above-named shall remove all trinks (*trimkos*) and other engines placed in the Thames"). The editor suggests that *trimkos* may stand for *triinkos*) 1380 Letter-Bk H, *Tryinke* (sing), -s 1421 f., *Trynkes* 1422, 1424, *Triinkes* 1424 Letter-Bk K, *Tryinkes*, *Tryinkis*, *Tryinkys* 1419 Liber Albus.

From *trink* is derived *trinker*, which means 1. 'a trink' (*Trynker* c. 1485), 2. 'a trinker-man'. *Trinker-man* 'a man who fishes with a net' is recorded from 1538 (NED).

Trink has not been satisfactorily explained. The suggestion that it may be compared with It *trinca* 'a cable', Span *trinca* 'a rope' is not accepted in NED. Dr. Sharpe, editor of Letter-Bk A, connects the word with Fr *treiner* 'to drag'.

Some of the early forms of *trink* quoted, such as *triinkes*, *tryinkes*, look decidedly suspicious, and this impression is confirmed by an early example of *trinker* 'trinker-man' occurring in *tromekeresnet* 1329 Letter-Bk E, p. 237. *Tromekeresnet* must mean 'trinker's net, trink'. It suggests that forms such as *treinekes*, *treinkes*, *triinkes*, *tryinkes* in early sources should be read *tremekes*, *tremkes*, *trimkes*, *trymkes*. This is corroborated by the spellings *trimkos* 1380, *Trymkes* 1423. In early MSS it is often impossible to distinguish *m* from *in* or *ni*. It is significant that Caxton in his books sometimes uses an *m* instead of *in*; see Hittmair, *Aus Caxtons Vorreden und Nachworten*, p. 13. In the spellings of *trink* adduced, editors have evidently been misled by the later form *trink* to read *treinekes* etc. instead of *tremekes*. However, I am not convinced that the spelling *tromekeresnet* is quite correct either. It is often difficult, not to say impossible, to

distinguish *e* and *o* in early MSS, and I believe what the scribe of Letter-Bk E wrote or meant to write was *tremekeresnet*. It is true *trungkes* 1556 may seem to support the form *tromekeresnet*, but *trungkes* may well be a misreading or misspelling of *tringkes*. The edition of Chron. Gr. Friars is old (Camden Soc. 1852) and not quite authoritative.

It thus appears that *trink* comes from ME *tremek(e)*; this is a definite result. ME *tremek(e)* later became *tremk(e)*, whence *trimk* and *trink*. The form *trimk* is first found in 1380, *trynk* first in 1376. The change *e* > *i* may have taken place before *m*, as in *limpet* (1602 etc.) from ME *lempet* or in *limphalt* (1530) from OE *lemphalt*. But very likely we have a case of the change *e* > *i* before *nk*; the spellings with *m* in late fourteenth and early fifteenth century sources may well be traditional.

As regards the etymology of ME *tremeke* I soon came to the conclusion that the word is related to Engl *trammel* 'a kind of fishing-net' from Fr *tramail*, *trém ail* 'a fishing- or fowling-net, with three layers of meshes'. The latter, which corresponds to It *tramaglio* etc., comes from MLat *tremaculum*, *tremaclum*, generally supposed to be derived from Lat *tri-* 'three' and *macula* 'mesh'. The MLat word is found in the Salic Law, where it appears as *tremaclem* (acc.) with variant readings such as *tremacle*, *tremalem*, *tremagilo*, *tramaculam*, *trimaclem*, *tremachlum*. In his notes to Hessels's edition of the Salic Law (London, 1880), col. 501, Kern remarks: "*Tremacle* .. is a diminutive, more or less Latinized. The Frank. word must have differed but slightly, if at all, from the Drenthian (N. Saxon) *treemke* (for *tremike*, *tramike*), a trammel. Both the English and Drenthian word point to a simplex *trami* or *tramia*." Kern thus takes *treemke*, as well as MLat *tremacle* and Engl *trammel*, to be of Germanic origin. Later scholars (as Skeat, Murray, Meyer-Lübke, Bloch) have more correctly held Fr *tramail*, Engl *trammel*, MLat *tremaculum* to be of Latin origin, and *treemke* is presumably so too.

But Kern's note is very valuable, because it draws attention to dial. Dutch *treemke* 'a trammel', a word not found in ordinary Dutch dictionaries and thus easily overlooked. It is recorded as *treemke* (*trijmke*, *trimkes*) 'schakel, vistuig' in K. Ter Laan, *Nieuw Groninger Woordenboek* (1929), and Frans Bly's *Verklarende Vakwoordenlijst van de Zee-Visserij* (ed. by G. Bly) in Kon. Vlaamsche Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde, Reeks VI, nr 51 (1931), under "staande netten" (vertical nets) mentions that "de schakels" in Groningen and Drente are called *polsnet*, *treemke*, or *warnet*. [De schakels] "bestaan uit een driedubbel net: de buitennetten met laddermazen en het binnen- of boezemnet met kleine mazen." The length varies from 10 to 75 metres, the breadth from one metre to a metre and a half.³

³ A *schakel*(net) is otherwise described as a "driedubbel gemaasd net" (= Fr. *tramail*) Verwijs & Verdam, "driewandig vischnet, waarmede men smalle wateren over de geheele breedte afzet" (van Dale, *Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*), "driekantig visnet" (Koenen's *Handwoordenboek der Nederlandse Taal*, 18th ed.).

It is obvious that ME *tremeke* is identical with this dialectal Dutch *treemke*, and doubtless both go back to MLat *tremaclum*. Presumably Dutch *treemke*, unless it is a loan-word from English, which is improbable, represents an early loan from MLat *tremaclum*, for the preservation of Lat *c* (*k*) would otherwise be remarkable. The probability seems to me to be that ME *tremeke* is a loan-word from Dutch. If it was taken direct from Latin, the adoption must have taken place in the Old English period, in itself not an improbable theory, as many Latin loan-words in Old English denote various implements, as OE *cucler* 'a spoon', *culter* 'a plough-share', *fann* 'a winnowing-fan', *segne* 'a fishing-net' (Lat *sagena*).

If ME *tremeke* is a Dutch loan-word, the loss of *l* will have taken place before the word was introduced into English, and the explanation must be left to Dutch scholars. If *tremeke* is an independent loan, the form without *l* is best explained as due to "corruption". It is a common experience that when words, especially long ones, are taken over from a foreign language, strange perversions of form are apt to occur. The hearer does not catch the exact form or forgets it and reproduces it erroneously. A change of Lat *tremaclum* to an OE *tremece* or the like is not more remarkable than that of Lat *papyrus* to OE *tapor*, or Lat *papaver* to OE *popæg*. This explanation of the loss of *l* may hold good also for Dutch *treemke*. Incidentally it may be added that a form with *-l-* is actually given in NED, viz. *tinklerman* for *trinkerman*, but it is only found in Thackeray's *Catherine* and obviously a late corruption.

To my knowledge, no description of a trink is extant. In NED it is defined as a fixed net. The Glossary of Liber Custumarum describes it as "a species of net or engine, usually attached to posts or anchors, for taking fish." There are many entries to show that a trink was often fixed. Thus a statute of 2 Hen. VI (quoted Letter-Bk A, p. 187, foot-note) forbids the fixing of these nets for any length of time to boats or anchors. But a trink was not always fixed. There are ordinances in Letter-Bk K (1422 ff.) forbidding the fixing of these nets, but allowing their use if they are "drawn like other nets through the water as of old accustomed" (p. 6). There were strict rules for the size of the meshes of a trink, the minimum being an inch and a half (see e.g. the first instance in NED). The passage in Letter-Bk A referred to above, a translation of the statute of 1311 in Liber Horn, runs thus: "And ther is another maner of nettes that is cleped Treinkys of the largenesse of two ynches and ynche and an half and no lasse." The passage is explained in Letter-Bk L (1485): "that Nettes called Trenkes be of the largenes of ij Inches in the Masshe of the fore part and an Inche and half large and no straiter in the Masshe of the later part of the same." From this it appears that a trink had meshes of two sizes and that it was a long net. It will have been of a type similar to a trammel, which is defined in NED as "a long narrow fishing-net, set vertically with floats and sinkers; consisting of two "walls" of large-meshed netting, between which is a net of fine mesh, loosely hung." The vague description of a trink in the example of 1485 hardly warrants us in identifying it with a

modern trammel in all its details. But it is reasonable to suppose that in early times the word *trammel* could be used of various kinds of long nets. In fact, NED tells us that the word is nowadays sometimes applied to other kinds of fishing-nets. The corresponding Dutch *treemke* denotes 'a trammel', and this tells in favour of *tremeke* (*trink*) being the name of a medieval trammel.

There is some reason to suppose that *tremeke* (*trink*) was a specific name of the trammel (or perhaps a special type of trammel) in the London district. In all the examples quoted in NED the trink is described as used in the Thames. The statement in NED that it was used also in other rivers very likely goes back to a passage in Letter-Bk K, p. 31, ordering the removal of engines called "Triinkes" from the Thames and other rivers. These other rivers were probably tributaries of the Thames. The only river other than the Thames which I have found mentioned in connection with trinks is the Medway (*Liber Albus*, p. 456). On the other hand I have not found the trammel mentioned in any of the London sources examined by me, though many kinds of fishing-nets are referred to in them. None of the examples under *trammel* in NED refer to its use in the Thames.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

Notes and News

Bulwer-Lytton on Art: a Measure of Victorian Taste

The following letter from the novelist to the Swiss painter Frank Buchser can hardly be called an important contribution to the theory of the arts in general or of painting in particular; but as Bulwer may fairly be regarded as representing a high general level of culture in the England of the mid-century, it forms a slight contribution toward a clearer knowledge of what the average educated Englishman of the time thought on the subject. The fact that Buchser, already a successful artist at home and in England, should invite Bulwer to his studio in order to ask his opinion and even his advice on his work is as much an indication of the position that the novelist held in circles outside his immediate field of literature as of the astuteness of the Swiss in furthering his own ends by fine flattery. Still, Buchser valued the letter highly enough to keep it for years and it only disappeared from his papers after he had published it in America.

In 1855, when the letter was written, Bulwer had been the conservative representative of Hertfordshire in Parliament for several years. Buchser was in his twenty-eighth year and had been working in England since the spring of 1853, chiefly as a painter of portraits at Scarborough during the

season. After spending the summer in his Swiss home he had returned to England in the autumn and the letter is one of the very few clues as to his whereabouts and doings during these years. More than ten years later he went to America for a protracted stay and exhibited some of his work at the American Academy of Design at New York in the Spring of 1867. His pictures were well received by the press, but his colleagues in the Academy do not seem to have been very cordial, for he never exhibited at their salon again and was actually planning a separate and "free academy" in New York the following winter. Although he drafted an appeal to the artists and the general public of the American metropolis to attend a meeting at which the new institution was to be discussed and definitely founded, his plan was never carried out. Bulwer's letter, which was published in the *Evening Post* of New York on March 17th., 1868, was accompanied by a commentary containing in a veiled form Buchser's own criticism of the art exhibited in America and the whole publication was obviously part of his propaganda for his own academy.

The letter as printed in the American newspaper is as follows :

To F. Buchser, Esq., 8, Barner street, Oxford street, London.

Sir : I am flattered by your request to call on you. Unfortunately I am not in town, nor likely to be so till Parliament meets, and then I fear I shall be too incessantly occupied to allow myself that pleasure. I could, however, be of no use to you in your laudable study of your great art.

My views on it are merely abstract and theoretical, and relate more to the conception of works of art than their execution. It is only, however, at a certain period of an artist's career that he should give much thought to the philosophy of his art.

The first thing requisite is to be perfect master of his materials, in other words, of his brushwork.

If you are that already, your way to eminence is secure, for perfect brushwork is rare and yet at once appreciated; if you are not, instead of helping you, I should but distract your attention from the preliminary essentials. A morning's study at any of our great galleries of the material execution of the famous masters will do more for you than my vague remarks could in a year.

The great secret of such study would be to obtain what philosophers call eclecticism — that is, the grasp of a liberal selection of what is best in the execution of each. Thus much labor is avoided, and the best kind of originality insensibly attained.

You arrive thus through the Venetian school of richness and harmony of color — you see through the Dutch the value of minute detail — while a purer taste will tell you where that taste is applicable, and where it should be subordinate.

In portrait painting, for instance, it is not desirable that a footstool should be so finely painted that it draws the attention from the face, but it is desirable that the exact hand of the individual should be carefully painted in, because there is as much character in a hand as in a lip or an eye. Our painters have neglected this. Titian and Vandyke did not.

In every picture, whether of portrait, figures or landscape, much is gained where one prevalent idea in your own mind becomes delicately apparent to the spectator. That is, the sentiment of the picture and the brushwork will go along with it insensibly. Look at Cuypp's sunsets — everything in the picture is subordinate to the effect on the mind which sunset is to produce, and how wonderful the sunset is in the mere brushwork ! But, just as before an author can well say to himself that such and such should be his conception, he must first have the mastery of style, and know thoroughly how to write, so before an artist should busy himself at all in conception he should thoroughly know

how to paint — and the fitting persons to tell him, if he has yet to learn in this respect, are not amateurs like me, but professed connoisseurs or brother artists.

If you could get such men as Landseer, Maclise, Stanfield, to look at your studio — men above all jealousy — they would be of real use to you. I have written thus at length, as I fear I shall be quite unable to visit you, my time here is so preoccupied.

Yours,

E. B. Lytton.

Knebworth, 9th. December, 1855.

Edwin Landseer, the animal-painter, and Daniel Maclise, portraitist and painter of famous historical tableaux, were both members of the Royal Academy and at the height of their fame. Clarkson Stanfield, also an academician, was a well-known marine painter and author of a "Battle of Trafalgar". There is no evidence that Buchser took the novelist's advice or that any of these men saw his work.

H. L.

"East Coker" by T. S. Eliot

Mr. Eliot's companion poem to *Burnt Norton* was first published under the title of *East Coker* as a supplement to the Easter number 1940 of *The New English Weekly*, p. 325-328. It has since been published separately by Messrs. Faber & Faber, London.

East Coker is the last, so far, of a series of longer poems, beginning with *The Waste Land* (1922) and *The Hollow Men* (1925), and continuing with *Ash-Wednesday* (1930) and *Burnt Norton* (1935). All of these poems mark important stages in the progress of Eliot's thought and poetic style. Although widely separated in time, they cannot be interpreted individually. They must be considered as a whole which is correlated with what is most immutable and fundamental in the poet's life and character. To illustrate this integrity of Eliot's major poems it may be best to recall his own definition of the unity which underlies all Shakespeare's plays. "What is 'the whole man'", he writes, "is not simply his greatest or maturest achievement, but the whole pattern formed by the sequence of plays; so that we may say confidently that the full meaning of any one of his plays is not in itself alone, but in that play in the order in which it was written, in its relation to all of Shakespeare's other plays, earlier and later: we must know all of Shakespeare's work in order to know any of it"¹. In Eliot's view this integrity of a poet's work consists not only in the inevitable and often superficial likeness which may be observed among the various writings of any one author, but it is an essential condition of that work's greatness. For so he declares in his next sentence: "No other dramatist of the time approaches anywhere near to this perfection of pattern superficial and

¹ *Selected Essays*. Faber, 1932. Essay on John Ford, p. 193 f.

profound; but the measure in which dramatists and poets approximate to this unity in a lifetime's work, is one of the measures of major poetry and drama". I do not doubt that this conception of the unity of an important poet's work is fully relevant to Eliot himself.

If one reads some of the reviews of *East Coker* in the periodical press² one cannot fail to notice two things. First, the reviewers' lack of comprehension for "the whole man", for the pattern of the poet's entire work. They recognise, of course, certain threads connecting this poem with earlier poems, but they do not venture to form a definite and clear idea about the meaning of these connections. Secondly, their struggle with obscure passages. One cannot help feeling the interest and the excitement of this struggle, for everyone who has read Eliot carefully and with pleasure will have experienced it. But I make no doubt that a good many of these obscurities are easily cleared up if one has grasped the main issues of the poet's religious and philosophical position. Eliot makes use of a highly personal system of symbols and allegories in order to give objective and universal stature to his deepest emotions and beliefs. Unless you are prepared to recognise and to accept the significance of these symbols and allegories, which, as G. W. Stonier remarks, "appear at important junctures and are repeated"³, they will be "dumb notes", and the passages where they occur will be "inoperative".

Eliot's references were particularly recondite in *The Waste Land*, and he had to add seven pages of Notes to elucidate them. Since then, his allusiveness has become more restrained, but there still remains enough of it to puzzle and to vex the common reader. Many of Eliot's literary and theological references are explained in his prose works, especially in his Elizabethan Essays and in the papers on Lancelot Andrewes and John Bramhall. But it must be stated again that no amount of explanation of out-of-the-way allusions can give the whole meaning of a poem like *East Coker*.

I do not intend, therefore, to comment upon this poem. I merely wish to quote a letter from Mr. Eliot, dated May 24, 1940, in which he explained to me some of the more difficult passages. He writes: "The title is taken from a village in Somerset where my family lived for some two centuries. The first section contains some phrases in Tudor English taken from 'The Governour' of Sir Thomas Elyot who was a grandson of Simon Elyot or Eliot of that village. The third section contains several lines adapted from 'The Ascent of Mount Carmel'. I think that the imagery of the first section (though taken from the village itself) may have been influenced by recollections of 'Germelshausen', which I have not read for many years. I don't think that the poem needs or can give rise to further explanation

² I have seen *T.L.S.*, Sept. 14, 1940, and *The New Statesman and Nation* of the same date. The poem was reviewed for this paper by G. W. Stonier, the author of a book of critical essays, *Gog Magog*, Dent, 1933, containing a very interesting article on "Eliot and the Plain Reader", p. 140-155.

³ *The New Statesman and Nation*, Sept. 14, 1940. P. 268.

than that". Everyone who reads and enjoys *East Coker* will appreciate the interest of these explanations. I am deeply obliged to Mr. Eliot for his kindness in offering them.

The passage from *The Governour* is not difficult to trace, but it may be helpful to complete the other two references. The one is contained in the last twelve lines of the third section of *East Coker*, and the reference is to *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* by St. John of the Cross (1542-1591), book I, chapter xiii. The other refers to the story entitled *Germelshausen* by Friedrich Gerstärker. I am informed that Gerstärker's story is frequently used in American schools as a text-book for beginners in German. The compelling beauty of this narrative may account for the lasting impression it made on the poet's mind if he read it, as we suppose he did, when he was a pupil at the Smith Academy in St. Louis.

There are, of course, various other references in *East Coker*, but Eliot probably thought they did not require special elucidation, either because they are not so significant for the main import of the poem as those already mentioned, or because they refer to books, such as Dante or Tennyson, whose influence on him had already become apparent in his earlier works.

Geneva.

H. W. HÄUSERMANN.

Reviews

The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England. By C. E. WRIGHT. Pp. xii + 310. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1939. 15/— net.

The author describes his book as "part of a much larger essay accepted in 1936 for the Ph. D. degree of Cambridge University" (p. vii) and "as a ramification of Professor Chadwick's work on the growth of literature" (p. viii). He tells us that "the subject was originally suggested to me by Professor Chadwick" (p. viii). We have, then, in this book a study of oral prose narrative literature. To such literature the author gives the name *saga* (in agreement with Chadwick). Unluckily, as the author points out, "the vernacular saga of the Dark Ages has disappeared (with the exception of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*) and its very presence and form have to be deduced from the works of Latin historians writing often at a date much later ... than the period of the people or incidents to which their works allude" (p. viii). It is the great service of this book to bring together passages which might have been based on vernacular saga in Saxon England, and to consider these passages in terms of the hypothesis that they in fact represent lost vernacular sagas.

Nobody doubts, or has ever doubted, that the stories which Dr. Wright

takes up were derived from native English oral tradition. By *saga*, however, one means a literary form comparable to the sagas of Iceland, not merely a tale handed down by word of mouth. It is Dr. Wright's thesis, then, that the English cultivated prose story-telling as a distinct *genre* of oral literature, an artistic form which existed alongside the alliterative verse-form traditional for story-telling as an art. The story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, which has actually come down to us in vernacular prose, fails to support Dr. Wright's thesis. We are told, it is true, that "such confusion as exists is 'due to grammatical and not stylistic defects'" (p. 27). But the distinction can hardly be taken seriously, and with the best will in the world one must affirm the usual judgment that the author of the entry in the *Chronicle* did not know how to handle prose as an artistic medium. Moreover, the *cantilenae* to which William of Malmesbury refers point to the existence of verse rather than prose sources, and Dr. Wright's comment, "what began as *saga* in the tenth century or even in the early decades of the eleventh might well have become a *cantilena* by about 1100" (pp. 30 f.), is not warranted by any evidence worthy of the name and must be dismissed as special pleading. We agree with the author, of course, that prose tales and anecdotes were current in Saxon times, as they have presumably been current in all periods of human history, and it may well be that some of these tales and anecdotes found record in the Latin historians, who would make use of oral tradition in prose and verse alike. But we see no reason to believe that an artistic oral prose-form existed comparable to the *saga*-form of the Icelanders and cultivated by the English as a literary *genre*. In OE times the artistic form for story-telling was alliterative verse.

Let me add a few comments on matters of detail. *Widsith* makes no mention of Theodoric the Goth, and the *Hervararsaga* knows neither Ermanric nor Theodoric (p. 3). The English invaders of Britain surely numbered far less than 100,000 souls (p. 6). What is the evidence that by the end of the sixth century the English were "certainly more civilized than the Britons" (p. 6)? *Maldon*, though a poem of the tenth century, is surely an example of "heroic poetry on contemporary events," Chadwick or no (p. 17). The Exeter Book belongs definitely to the tenth century (p. 18). The use of verse for speeches and prose for narrative is characteristic of some of the poems of the *Edda*, though the distinction is not made with rigor; it is not characteristic of the sagas (p. 38). The procedure followed by the monks of Bury St. Edmunds need not have been followed "at the birth of all sagas" (p. 63; cf. p. 247). Lucas might have been a Welshman (p. 64). The sagas are not good evidence for the customs of the English court (p. 66). The story of the death of Oswine may have been "a masterpiece of vernacular *saga*" (p. 85), but it is going beyond the evidence to say that "the vigilance of countless audiences and the minds of so many *saga*-tellers working on it must have made it" such a masterpiece. The reading *rex Uuestanglorum* (for *rex Eastanglorum*) is hardly a case of inaccurate memory (p. 89); it seems more likely that we have here a copyist's blunder: *east* was misread as *eust* and corrected to

uest (a and u were readily confused in the insular hand). The reading *ƿryðe ne wæg* (*Beowulf* 1931) was suggested by Schücking; it was adopted by Klaeber in his first two editions but dropped in his third (p. 93 footnote). *Flyting* "war of words" (p. 137) is better spelt *fliting*. I do not find it in the dictionaries, but the verb *flite* is duly recorded. Dr. Wright could have made more use of Saxo Grammaticus, particularly in Chapter IV of his book.

Baltimore, U.S.A.

KEMP MALONE.

The Tragedy of Hamlet. A critical edition of the Second Quarto, 1604, with introduction and textual notes. By THOMAS MARC PARROTT and HARDIN CRAIG. 247 pp. Princeton University Press. Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 1938. 16/— net.

It has long been a generally recognized fact that whatever the relations between the three *Hamlet* texts, that of the second Quarto (1604/5) is closest to what Shakespeare wrote, and therefore deserves the greatest attention of scholars.

Up to 1938 there was no critical edition of this genuine text, nor even an exact reprint. In that year there appeared the beautiful facsimile of Professor Campbell of Columbia¹, but the authors of the work now under discussion had evidently not seen it before they went to press. No doubt, beside Prof. Campbell's reprint there is room for a critical text edition, and we may say that this one, with its introduction and copious notes, both textual and exegetical, supplies a long felt want.

The introduction in brief outline presents the sources of *Hamlet*. The study of these carries us to ancient Scandinavia, to the Ireland of the 10th century and to Iceland, to Saxo Grammaticus and Belleforest. Then follows the dramatization in England by Kyd, of which first *Hamlet* drama we seem to possess a much corrupted version in the mysterious old German play "Der Bestrafte Brudermord", after which we come to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

The authors observe that when Shakespeare turned to the *Hamlet* theme he was dealing with a play more or less familiar to theatre-goers for a dozen years or so. So his handling of the problem had to be in the nature of a revision. This first revision was on the boards between September 1599 and February 1601. Some time in 1603 there appeared the first Quarto of *Hamlet*, the "pirated version", the "bad" quarto. Like many other critics

¹ Cf. *E. S.* XX (1938) 237.

Parrott and Craig think that this was a surreptitious edition, and that a pirate actor had a share in it. Their view is briefly as follows.

Shakespeare revised Kyd's old play. This revision was not a very thorough one. A good deal of Kyd's text remained. There are a good many verbal parallels to the *Spanish Tragedy*. Now Shakespeare's revision was too long. So it was shortened by cuts and in this way fitted for a tour in the provinces. The prompt-book of this abridged version was supplemented by some dishonest actor who had access to some parts of the complete version. His contribution consisted of (a) the parts which he had acted himself (Marcellus, Voltimand), (b) his memorial reconstructions of certain parts of the play.

Some twenty years ago Prof. Dover Wilson defended very much the same theory. I did not believe it then, and I do not believe it now. I agree with the revision, and the shortened stage-text. But I do not believe in the surreptitious character of the Q_1 text, nor am I converted to that remarkable personage, the dishonest actor, who supplies the printer with perfect parts (which he had played himself), as well as with the most garbled versions imaginable, when his memory left him in the lurch. This "pirate" is too versatile to satisfy me.

The title-page of the First Quarto is honest, giving the names of the author and the publishers, as also that of the company that had acted the play. A year afterwards the actors entrusted one of these publishers with the publication of the honest Q_2 . They do not seem to have quarrelled with him on account of Q_1 . Q_1 was published after May 19, 1603. The theatres were closed because of the plague from March 1603 till April 1604. So it was during a period of pestilence and poverty that the first Quarto was published. I take it that the actors, the rightful owners, sold their shortened text to Ling and Trundell, after they had returned from their tour in the provinces, when it was no longer much use to them, and they were in sore need of money owing to the closure of the theatres.

The manuscript underlying the second Quarto was in Shakespeare's handwriting. It consisted of his "foul papers", which he presented to his company. He or some scribe copied it, made the cuts and alterations necessary for representation on the stage and submitted this clean copy to the Master of the Revels. This copy with the licence and the prompter's added stage-directions became the "book of the play", the official prompt-book. The principal reasons for assuming that the MS. for Q_2 was not the prompt-book are:

- (a) the extraordinary length of the Q_2 -text, which could never be acted in the two hours of an Elizabethan stage-performance, and
- (b) the noticeable absence of necessary stage-directions from Q_2 .

The manuscript for Q_2 was Shakespeare's second revision of the *Hamlet* drama. This time he did the work thoroughly, so that in Q_2 there remain no pre-Shakespearean traces in metre and diction as in Q_1 .

The Folio text must be derived from a third MS. I used to think that the "copy" for the *Hamlet* text of the first folio was a copy of the second

quarto which had been used at the theatre as prompt-book. I now agree with the authors that this cannot have been the case. The differences in spelling, punctuation and the use of capitals are too great. If you were to take a copy of the second quarto and on its pages insert all the alterations, great and small, necessary to produce the folio text, the book would be so marred that no compositor could use it. Besides, who would take the trouble to change *ee* into *ea*, add mute *e*'s, change minuscules into capitals, pepper the page with punctuation marks, add a few long passages, all in a printed book that had served twenty years in the theatre, if he could with less trouble and with far better result have a fair copy made by some penniless scribe?

The following hypothesis for the provenience of the copy for the First Folio text of *Hamlet* is offered by the authors. When Shakespeare first handed over his draft, the "foul papers" of *Hamlet* (which was to become the copy for Q_2) to the company, a transcript was made of it to serve as a basis for the prompt-book. This transcript was an abbreviated copy of Shakespeare's manuscript, presumably in a clearer hand with better, i.e. more modern, spellings, more definite stage-directions and so on. Before the prompt-book was prepared from it, heavier cuts for theatrical purposes were indicated in it, further stage-directions inserted; possible alterations, suggested by the players, made in the text; in fact, it was so marked up that while an intelligent theatrical scribe could prepare a usable prompt-book from it, it was not in a condition to send as "copy" to a printer. Therefore Heminges and Condell probably had a clean copy made of this original transcript. Into this second transcript there crept by the carelessness or presumption of the scribe many of the changes and errors which have been noted as characteristic of the Folio text. That it was not the prompt-book that served as "copy" for the Folio also appears from the fact that the Folio contains two long passages (on Denmark being a prison and the child-actors) which had been cancelled for political reasons in the "copy" for Q_2 , which for the same reasons were not acted, but which had found their way into the first transcript and had there been preserved, besides numerous minor passages dropped from Q_2 through the haste or ignorance of the compositor.

The conclusion is, therefore, that a modern editor must follow Q_2 wherever possible since it rests directly upon Shakespeare's manuscript, whereas Q_1 and F_1 may occasionally be used to throw light on corrupt passages and supply one or two longer passages omitted from Q_2 .

The text of this edition is faithful to that of the existing six copies of the second quarto. Where it deviates from the latter, the reasons for doing so are given in the notes. These notes attempt the interpretation of some famous *cruces* and explain obsolete words. They do not offer dramatic or aesthetic criticism, and do not try to solve any other problem of *Hamlet* than those presented by the text, which they hope is a close approximation to the true text that Shakespeare wrote.

I think the authors have achieved their aim and that all lovers of Shakespeare are to be congratulated on the publication of this scholarly edition of the true text of *Hamlet*.

Amsterdam.

H. DE GROOT.

Tides in English Taste (1619-1800). A Background for the Study of Literature. By B. SPRAGUE ALLEN. 2 volumes. xviii & 269 pp. and viii & 282 pp. 8°. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 1937.

Wechselseitige Erhellung der Künste has long been a field of research and speculation among Continental scholars and we have had a brilliant example of it in our own pages. But what Fehr attempted four years ago in his article on the Antagonism of Forms is at once more modest and considerably more profound than what is offered in the two volumes of Mr. Allen's posthumous work. For the American scholar's problem is not one of style, properly speaking, but of taste — which is not the same thing. While Fehr attempted to trace parallel expressions, in the various arts, of a fundamental spiritual movement which is represented for us chiefly in the poetry of the eighteenth century, Mr. Allen brings together the various streams of influence which carried masses of new matter into the crucible of English culture and made them a part of its civilization. While Fehr's problem was mainly aesthetic and philosophical and its solution a tenuous thread of speculation that almost disappears in the poetry of the Romantics, Allen's problem is a sociological one and has so little of the aesthetic about it that it disregards entirely so important a contribution to the English culture of the period as painting. Hogarth and Reynolds are mentioned only as writers and social critics and form merely a part of a panorama of English life of surprising breadth and richness and — vulgarity! For no study short of an encyclopaedic "Johnson's England" gives such a vivid impression of the atmosphere in which the literature of the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries flourished in England and of the extremes to which the tastes of a swiftly changing society growing wealthy by a trade that brought it rapidly into close contact with the ends of the earth could go.

Mr. Allen set himself the task to discuss "the most conspicuous phases of taste that developed in England between Inigo Jones's Banqueting House (1619) in the classic style and the close of the eighteenth century". In an introductory chapter he characterizes the "waywardness of Elizabethan classicism" from the point of view of the confirmed classicist that he was himself. We are then introduced to the "new vision of order", which takes us to the "building mania" of the eighteenth century and the

reflection of architectural ideas in letters, as well as the satirical criticism that classical architecture aroused. Gardening, as we all know, and town-planning developed along parallel lines, but the forces that were to disrupt the power of the classical spirit over the age of Queen Anne were already gathering. For during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Europe discovered the civilizations of the Far East and the invasion of England by Oriental art: porcelaine, lacquer, wall-paper and furniture, created a rivalry between Indian chintz and English textiles that more than once led to riot and disorder. Classical criticism attacked Oriental art sharply, the influence of which upon literature, both from the Indian and the Chinese side, is demonstrated by the author. When the challenge of the Middle Ages gathered force classicism was already on the defensive, and though "Gothic taste" in its turn was subjected to classical criticism, the Rococo was a new danger to the classicists, whose position in gardening was definitely turned by the second revolution in garden design, the experiments in naturalism and the collaboration of painter and gardener in the new taste. The natural garden had its artificialities and sentimental vagaries, as well as its reflection in literature, and its concomitant was the tourist as the embodiment of the new interest in the wildness of nature. Hostile criticism of the natural garden there was, to be sure, but the resurgence of the classical ideal at the end of the century affected architecture, primarily, not the garden.

Thus, in a few captions, the argument of a compendious piece of research. Naturally, the main lines of development in the various arts discussed are those found in the handbooks. But the author has done an immense amount of investigation himself and his pages are filled with his own observations and his own points of view. Everywhere he has gone back to the sources, to the theoretical works written during the periods under discussion and illustrates his own pages with cuts and reproductions taken from the time. His judgments are sometimes severe and not always as impassionate as one would expect in an historian. For his classical taste Elizabethan architecture had a "deficient sense of scale", building its portals "without due regard for congruity", being "ignorant" of the "proper apportionment of space" to be devoted to windows and wall, and depending largely on the "coarse and frequently bizarre architectural ideas of the Germans and Dutch". From this point of view, of course, the comparatively short and tempestuous career of classicism in England is something of a tragedy and one is left with the impression that classicism, after all, was a strange bird in the English climate.

But, the classical bias in the author once recognized, there is much that one can thankfully accept among his purely historical observations. Except for Ben Jonson's two tragedies, Inigo Jones' banqueting hall preceded by fifty years anything of the same spirit in literature. Much of the aridity of classical architecture in the English country house of the eighteenth century is due to the fact that many such edifices were planned and executed by wealthy amateurs with but an insufficient knowledge and no practical

experience in the art, who raised houses in England the models for which were built for the climate of Italy (Palladio!). Such men were far below the intellectual level of a Dryden or a Pope, who knew that subservience to a dogma alone did not make a great artist. In this respect at least the Elizabethans, too, were their superiors and the criticism which classical architecture called forth shows that between 1660 and 1740, i.e. long before the Gothic revival, "loyalty to the older architecture is expressed unequivocally". In gardening, the Italian influence in the seventeenth century came via France and was, "on the whole, negligible". In the eighteenth, the passion for ostentatious building on the part of the newly rich became an attraction for the curious traveller and among people of fashion touring from one estate to another was a popular amusement. Under the surface of the classical fad, however, love for mediaeval art, especially churches and their windows, persisted unbroken and actually the classicists were probably a minority in the country. The antiquaries, who, like Anthony à Wood in the seventeenth century, lived mostly outside the social sets of the upper classes, were truer representatives of the national taste than their betters and Walpole's Strawberry Hill — itself not by any means the first Gothic experiment of the time! — was not revolutionary at all, nor was it meant to be. As for Rococo, the style which is generally regarded as having been non-existent in England, Mr. Allen makes the rather startling statement that it was both "abundant and various". Not in architecture, to be sure; there were no Asam brothers in England. But in interior decoration there seems to have been plenty of it, especially at Vauxhall, in the Bodleian and in a number of country houses. The natural garden was early prefigured in certain paintings by the Italians, French and Netherlanders depicting the Garden of Eden as a beautiful wilderness, whence it was adopted by Milton generations before it became the fashion in reality. The transition, supported though it was by Shaftesbury's philosophy of the essential beauty of nature, was much slower and more timid than is generally realized and for a long time there was a marked discrepancy between theory and practice in some of the loudest proclaimers of the new style.

On the literary side Mr. Allen is almost exclusively interested in the reflexion the various tides of taste found as criticism or literary material. Remarks on the deeper aspects of literary style, such as the one on Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones, are only casual and never followed up. On the rather shallow level thus maintained the author has some interesting things to say. Milton's poetic architecture stands midway between the mediaeval and the classical, partaking of both. Shaftesbury was a conservative classicist except on gardening, where his moralistic philosophy was revolutionary. While India only succeeded in rousing the English imagination late in the eighteenth century, China appears as early as Ben Jonson and serves to fill out the inadequacies of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* late in the 1690's. It was a staple source for scenic effects in masques, operas and the like and even in serious drama so far as occasional

imitations of *The Little Orphan* went, before it served as the ideal commonwealth for popular works on sociology and furnished satirists of society with the all-wise Chinese gentleman made a classic by Goldsmith in *The Citizen of the World*. Enthusiasm for China and things Chinese, however, was not unanimous and both Defoe and Johnson belonged to the rather contemptuous opposition. In the matter of the natural garden, though Milton's Paradise remained without influence on his contemporaries and Dryden's dramatic adaptation, *The State of Innocence*, was staged apparently as a formal garden, yet there are indications that the extremes of formalism met with some opposition and that Thomson only took up an already existing line when he gave his nature-descriptions in *The Seasons* and *The Castle of Indolence* in the spirit of Shaftesbury. Gardening touches literature, of course, in the person of Pope, whose essentially formal garden was generally admired for its naturalness, and in Shenstone, whose Leasowes became the arch-type of the sentimental garden with its wealth of literary associations. It is the measure of Mr. Allen's insight, by the way, that he refuses to recognize an honest love of nature behind the formal language and classical clichés of *Windsor Forest*. The fact that Pope practically grew up in the country, was as active a youngster as his health and size permitted, often sought rest and recuperation in the country as a man and has left more than one witness of his deep sense of the beauty of "wild" nature, all this seems to have made no impression upon Mr. Allen's judgment.

There are evidences, too, of positive immaturity in the book, both in the shape of superficial judgment and rash formulation. To speak of the "cosmic platitudes of Shaftesbury" hardly becomes a writer whose own style abounds in platitudes — of the un-cosmic kind, to be sure. His discussion of the classical illustrations of Shakespeare's plays in the eighteenth century betrays a curious ignorance of the history of the English stage, just as his belated indignation at the "distortions of Shakespeare which disgraced the seventeenth century stage" sounds a bit sophomoric. The explanation he offers of Crusoe's opinions on the Chinese is superficial, almost trivial, and one wonders what Percy's supposed "historic sense" had to do with his interest in "remote civilizations and the poetry of peoples who had never heard of Aristotle or the *Ars Poetica*". And why should a dramatist be "hampered" by an unrealistic technique? (II. 9) The repeated misspelling of Claude's name as "Lorraine" may be a slip, but at times one is not quite sure that the author means what he says. Did the romantic revolt, e.g., really "come to a head" as early as the middle of the eighteenth century? (I. 22) And in what does the "apotheosis" of the Rococo at Potsdam and Würzburg consist? (II. 110) Many a sentence betrays a weak grasp of the English language (e.g. why should British relations with China, once "established by commerce", have to be "cemented by the importation of Chinese manufactures"? (II. 17) how does "a point of view" manage to "crystallize into a dogma"? (II. 27) At II. 110 the combination "passion for

moderation" is awkward; at II. 143 the word "reactionaries" is misapplied; at I. 86 the intended meaning of the sentence: "In its elements ..." is reversed, and the same is true of the sentence: "... they unconsciously reveal that ..." (at II. 129.) And most readers would have been grateful if the majority of the author's jaunty pleasantries had been suppressed. It is a pity that their sense of pious respect for the dead did not carry the editors to the point of clearing away such blemishes from an otherwise interesting and useful book.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

SHAKESPEARE: *Le Marchand de Venise*. Traduit, avec une introduction, par F. C. DANCHIN. pp. LIII, 187, and XXIII (Notes). fr. 21.— Sewn.

BACON: *Essais*. Traduits, avec une introduction, par MAURICE CASTELAIN. pp. XLI and 307. fr. 40.— Sewn.

Les Prérromantiques anglais. Choix de leurs poèmes, traduit, avec une introduction et des notices par ROGER MARTIN. pp. XVIII and 345. fr. 40.— Sewn.

(*Collection Bilingue des Classiques Anglais* sous la direction de L. CAZAMIAN. Editeur: F. Aubier, Paris. 1940.)

As an aid to language study bilingual texts may be serviceable, provided the translation be reasonably close and the student's gifts above the average. The device has been warmly advocated by that pious linguist George Borrow, who actually recommended the Bible as a key to any language, however remote. Possibly the advice was intended for budding missionaries, or what would the Bible Society, his employers, have said to so profane a suggestion! But the idea seems sound enough and it even has a spice of adventure to lend zest to the undertaking. If we could speed our promising pupils on their way equipped, after some phonetic priming, with pronouncing dictionaries, their double texts on congenial subjects, etc. and confidently await their return at stated intervals to report satisfactory progress, what a change from our approved spoonfeeding methods!

Applied to the study of literature, on the other hand, the bilingual device is distinctly one of the effort-saving order. The juxtaposed translation constitutes a medium of approach to an unfamiliar language for the benefit of those whose linguistic attainments are not on a par with their literary interest. Could anything seem more plausible? Yet, to the wary mind of the experienced teacher with his instinctive distrust of short cuts the objection will suggest itself that in this aspect of the method the original

text is apt to be ousted from its place of honour and at best reduced to that of second fiddle to its adventitious accompaniment. In the case of poetry it might even come to serve little purpose beyond releasing its rendering from the formal obligations imposed on an independent translation. Moreover, and quite apart from these considerations, it is open to serious doubt whether the method is to be accounted an asset if applied to the multitude of writers less difficult of approach than say Shakespeare or than those representing older stages of the language. With such English as he can muster, the necessary equipment and some perseverance the student may go less far and fare better. Surely, there is less harm in finding that one has been somewhat ambitious than in having one's thinking done for one, so as to be baulked from the outset of that legitimate sense of achievement which is the natural stimulus to further endeavour.

M. Danchin's conception of his task fully answers the purpose of the essentially didactic series. Unhampered by formal handicaps he has turned his opportunities to excellent account, the result being a fine, straightforward prose rendering truly remarkable for fidelity both to the text and to the spirit of the original. He has contrived to retain even such features as e.g. Launcelot's 'malapropisms' or Shylock's hebraisms, and rhyming endlines. A few minor blemishes or inaccuracies revealed at a first perusal may in most cases be due to deliberate sacrifices to smoothness.

I, 2, 9 Superfluity comes sooner by white hairs, but *competency* lives longer. —
Nécessaire vit plus longtemps

I, 2, 57 so full of *unmannerly* sadness —
si plein de tristesse.

The epithet, coming from a woman of the world, is a damning reflection on the Count's *savoir vivre*, or the lack of it.

I, 2, 125 but I *dote* on his very absence —
que je ne brûle de savoir absent

somehow does not satisfy. But this may be mere cavilling, as also the mention of

I, 3, 38 the Nazarite *conjured* the devil into —
le Nazaréen a fait entrer le diable.

Very felicitous on the other hand is e.g.

II, 1, 12 Except to steal your thoughts, my gentle queen
Si non pour me glisser en votre cœur, ma gente reine.

In the introduction to the play a novel theory is propounded concerning the famous court scene passage IV, 1, 185 et seqq. Portia's speech is construed into a plea for mercy in behalf of Essex imprisoned in the Tower to await the Queen's pleasure, which for once was not to be a 'renovatio

amoris'. To lend colour to this conjecture M. Danchin suggests that it was an interpolation inspired by the Earl of Southampton, both Essex' friend and Shakespeare's patron. Ingenious arguments are adduced to dispose of the well-known Lopez theory.

The volume on the Preromantics contains selections from Lady Winchelsea, Parnell, Dyer, Blair, Young, Thomson, Collins, Gray, Shenstone, Akenside, J. Warton, T. Warton, Goldsmith, Beattie, Macpherson, Chatterton, Cowper, Crabbe, Burns, Blake. Professor Martin has gone to the pains of providing a metrical — but rhymeless — translation, a probably ill-advised compromise which necessarily involves frequent losses of accuracy. Dictates of metre forbade the use of the right word e.g. in

Dans la vallée étroite et fraîche de la vie,
Ils suivirent sans bruit le cours de leur chemin,

for

Along the cool sequestered vale of life etc. (Gray, *Elegy*.)

or prescribed the suppression of the adjective in

contre la porte, le tic-tac de la pendule,
l'armoire destinée à jouer double rôle

for

The *varnished* clock that click'd behind the door,
The chest, contrived a double debt to pay (Goldsmith. *The Village*.)

Naturally these are unavoidable concessions, and it is only fair to say that in spite of all the self-imposed limitations, the translator has acquitted himself very creditably of his task.

The introduction is an incisive and highly instructive study of the psychological aspects implied in such terms as 'reason', 'nature', 'wit', 'romantic'.

The translation of Bacon's smooth and simple prose calls for no comment. Professor Castelain insists that Bacon's *Essays* are a landmark in the history of English prose and that they have not come in for due recognition as such.

If these critical texts with introductions and full bibliographies are warmly recommended — also to those who have no use for the translations —, it is because one welcomes every opportunity to pay tribute to the admirable products of modern French scholarship in the field of English letters.

The Hague.

G. H. GOETHART.

Die Metapher in Merediths und Hardys Lyrik. Von HILDEGARD LITTMANN. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 6. Band.) 485 pp. Bern: A. Francke. Price Sw. frs. 14.—.

The metaphor as a means of poetical expression has of late kept the minds of many men busy. It is certainly worth considering closely, for the metaphor is a poetical element of the highest order. The artistic will shapes the image from the subconscious, while it entirely depends on the poet who creates what the image and the strength of that image will be. The creation of a metaphor is the result of an inner process and the book under discussion is meant to elucidate in how far the individuality of a poet may become clear to us from this rhetorical figure. The author has made it her object to show how in this tiny germ, the poetical image, the entire attitude of a poet is crystallised, so that when a comparison is drawn between the use of images in two different poets — in this case Meredith and Hardy — the essential difference between these two poets will become manifest.

The author has set herself no easy task. She has painstakingly classified the most outstanding, characteristic metaphors in the poetry of the above-mentioned artists. In the case of Meredith the classification of subjects is as follows: Mother Earth as the mythic, metaphorical symbol — Animated nature — Man — Images from the human sphere; in the case of Hardy we find the following classifications: the Superhuman Powers — Nature in the poetical image — Man — Things. In the conclusion the personalities of the two poets are contrasted by means of their use of those metaphors that are most pregnant. This is the end and aim for which the author has so laboriously chosen her instances from that wealth of poetry left behind by George Meredith and Thomas Hardy. The result at which she has finally arrived is that the two poets, who at first sight seem diametrically opposed poetical personalities, have yet many a trait in common. Both have outgrown Victorianism and belong to modern times. Both, freed from religious dogma, wish to know the ultimate meaning of life, the powers that rule our lives and the root of all being. Each seeks his own way to arrive at this knowledge; both are philosophical poets therefore; nearly all their poems are tried by the intellect and they are very seldom a direct expression of the emotions. This gives to their poetry a wonderful unity; it bears the imprint of their attitude to life. In this they are one. Also in their great love of nature; many metaphors clearly show how profoundly familiar they are with even the slightest phenomenon of nature.

Both, however, were deeply conscious of the difference that existed between them. This difference between the two poets has often been expressed by the terms optimism — pessimism; but the author does not think this an adequate definition, though it contains much that is good. They differ fundamentally in their attitude to life; why Meredith believes in the positive values of life and Hardy sees only the transitory side of all phenomena cannot be explained; the author thinks that we must accept

these facts as we accept the sun and the rain. Another fundamental difference is that Meredith is didactic; he believes in the triumph of the good, in the harmony of things created, in the progress of man, who must use all his powers and his intellect to shape his own destiny. Hardy, however, does not display this fortitude. He is rather contemplative, knows no way out of the sufferings of life to which man is the innocent victim. "Destiny is not shaped by man," he says, "but by chance; he is powerless under the sway of these violent powers of fatality." In their attitude to woman they also differ materially. Death to Meredith means evolution, to Hardy pain and sorrow and ultimate annihilation. One might continue to enumerate all the subtle differences of character the author has found in comparing and opposing to each other the metaphors of the two poets; those interested are advised to peruse the book for themselves. Miss Littmann has shown how the poetical image which is the metaphor can reflect the character and the attitude of a poet. It can and does reflect it, but it is not the only means to reflect it. For there are other aspects of poetry that reflect the poet's character and attitude and nearly five hundred pages of metaphor may easily make us forget this. In treating only the metaphor for the reading of character one narrows down one's field of vision of the poet under treatment very considerably; however, this limitation taken for granted, the author has given a clever, thorough exposition of her object.

Figurative language is for the poet one means of expressing himself; it takes a great poetical genius to do this well. For figurative language often leaves the reader unmoved; sometimes the reader cannot feel what the poet has felt or the poet has failed to transmit his thought or feeling to the reader and leaves him cold. The reason is that figurative language is mostly the result of an effort of the intellect, not of the heart, so that the emotions are not stirred in the reader. It is there that both Meredith and Hardy fail, they have both lavished their poetical imagination on their novels, but in their poetry we seek their deepest feelings and passions in vain. Hence it is that the characters of these two poets could not be satisfactorily distilled from their figurative language as it does not exhibit this quality. With neither is poetry charged with emotion though both possessed it, as their novels show, abundantly. This must be called a drawback to such a searching examination of two eminent men. Perhaps the author will not agree with us when we state that the feelings not expressed in figurative language are the purest and the sublimest.

Groningen.

C. E. BAEHRENS.

An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds. By E. KRUISINGA. 7th Edition. 218 pp. Groningen-Batavia: P. Noordhoff N.V. 1940. Price f 2.50, cloth f 3.00.

As with the 6th edition, which was reviewed here in 1936, the general plan of the book has remained the same, the chapter headings and the numbering of the paragraphs are unaltered; but there are again changes and additions in details, the result of another five years' research, above all of the author himself, but, with him, of many scholars.

In the last edition the additions were made necessary by the growing importance of the musical element in language instruction. Thus Intonation was mentioned for the first time, Stress was dealt with more thoroughly, Experimental Phonetics was dwelt upon. This line of investigation is still being pursued to-day. We know more of these things now than even a few years ago. Thus the chapter on Intonation is re-written, changed for the better. Also in that on Stress there are a few additions. In § 125, e.g., mention is made of the connection between stress and voice: weak syllables are apt to contain voiced instead of voiceless consonants. This voicing process, known elsewhere as Verner's Law, took place in England in the 16th century and affected fricatives and affricates after unstressed vowels. The pronunciations *ɔv*, *wɪð*, *ɪg'zɪbɪt*, *'grɪnɪdʒ*, are due to it. The sound-change also affected *s*, spelt *ss*. Thus we have *z* in *to dis'solve*, *to pos'sess*, *des'sert*, *hus'sar*; *s* in *to 'dissipate*, *disso'lution*. But for various reasons there are many exceptions, *z* in *'hussy*, *'scissors*, *s* in *dis'sent*, *to dis'sect*. This should have been more clearly brought out (§ 298). It might have been mentioned that stress also accounts for the two ways of pronouncing *dis-*: *dis'ease*, *dis'aster*, on one hand, *disa'gree*, *diso'bey*, on the other. This hint is of no practical value though, as there are far too many exceptions. — In § 123 the different treatment of "up" in "to 'run up a 'big 'bill" and "to 'run 'up the 'stairs" is pointed out. It is due to the fact that even-stress compounds have single stress when followed (or preceded) by another stressed word. In the first instance "to run up" is a compound verb, a so-called phrasal verb, in the second "to run" is an intransitive verb, followed by the local preposition "up". Cf. "That's a 'nice easy 'chair" and "That's a 'nice, 'easy trans'lation".

The changes which a living idiom constantly undergoes make other alterations necessary. § 266 contains new information about the sound *h*. There is a tendency to-day to drop initial *h* in unstressed syllables, not only in the word "hotel" mentioned here, but in many others e.g. in historical, horizon, habitual, hereditary. It might have been added, too, that the form without *h* is especially frequent when *d* or *t* precedes, e.g. "a good (h)otel". Cf. also *sentɪ'li:nə* (the island), *snt'helənə* (the Saint). At the beginning of a sentence, however, the *h* is not dropped, except occasionally with hotel.

A number of additions give us information about existing and non-existing sound combinations in Dutch and in English. This is a point that has

frequently been dealt with by scholars in recent years, especially by the phonologists of the Prague School. They have established and described what they call "the phonological system" of a language, which is not only a catalogue of the sounds and sound combinations occurring in a particular language, but also of the possible positions of these sounds. To our mind this trend of investigation is not conducive to much new insight into the structure of a language.

A few points of terminology call for remark. It is rightly pointed out that what is generally called "assimilation" comprises two different phenomena: change of sound (e.g. s for z) and modification of a sound (e.g. dental t for alveolar t). The latter is now termed "adaptation". — In the 6th edition the diphthongs were classified according to the last element. Now there is a new distinction. Yet to call ou, ei "half-diphthongs" is not an improvement. They are narrow diphthongs i.e. there is a narrow space between the lowest and the highest point of articulation. Even ai, au, in some speakers' pronunciation, are very narrow; but they are real diphthongs for all that.

Finally, one or two miscellaneous corrections:

§ 91 note 5. It is not accurate to say that the ə of modern, southern, is different from the ə of London. The sound is exactly alike in Standard English. It is true that in certain words that have an r in the spelling, especially derivatives in -ed, -s, like honoured, manners, fathers, some speakers use another variant of the sound, one which is lower and longer than the ə of "London" (symbol ɐ of the Intern. Phon. Ass.) But ɐ is not used in southern, modern.

§ 256. The most usual pronunciation of garage is gæridʒ.

Basel.

MARIA SCHUBIGER.

Bibliography

PERIODICALS

Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift. 25, 1/2. Jan.-Feb. 1937. L. Brandl, Robert Bridges' „Vermächtnis der Schönheit". — Id. 25, 9/10. Sept.-Okt. 1939. F. A. Voigt, Gerhart Hauptmann und England. — O. Boerner, Shakespeare und der Barock. — K. von Ettmayer, Das Phonem im Sprachunterricht. — Id. 25, 11/12. Nov.-Dez. 1937. P. Meissner, Die geistige Krise der englischen Demokratie. — Id. 26, 1/2. Jan.-Febr. 1938. J. Hashagen, Der Einfluss der angelsächsischen Kultur auf das deutsche Mittelalter. — Id. 26, 3/4. März-April 1938. F. R. Schröder, Der Ursprung der Hamletsage. — S. Robert, Zugang zu Ruskins „Fors Clavigera". — Id. 26, 5/6. Mai-Juni 1938. A. Pirkhofer, Zur Einheit des dichterischen Impulses in Thomas Hardys Kunsttheorie und Dichtung. — Id. 26, 7/8. Juli-Aug. 1938. H. Matthes, Das Ormulum, sein Gehalt und sein Verfasser. — Id. 26, 9/10. Sept.-Okt. 1938. P. Hultsch, Das Denken Nietzsches in seiner Bedeutung für England. — W. A. Reichart, Die Germanistik in Amerika. — Id. 26, 11/12. Nov.-Dez. 1938. E. Th. Sehr, Charles

Morgans Begriff vom Wesen der Kunst. — Id. 27, 1/2. H. Bock, Vom Ideal adliger Lebensführung in England. — Id. 27, 3/4. März-April 1939. P. Meissner, Volkskulturelle Strömungen in der modernen Literatur Grossbritanniens. — Id. 27, 5/6. Mai-Juni 1939. W. Jacobi, Bühnen- und Lesedrama. Eine Untersuchung an Shelleys „Prometheus Unbound“. — Id. 27, 7/8. Juli-Aug. 1939. H. Bock, Die Bedeutung der Frauen für die geistige Kultur Englands im 18. Jahrhundert. — Id. 27, 9/12. Sept.-Dez. 1939. W. Schmidt, Die Ueberleistungszene in der Volksballade vom Mädchenmörder. — Id. 28, 1/3. Jan.-März 1940. J. Lohse, Zur Frühgeschichte der nordseegermanischen (-ingwäonischen) Dialekte. — K. Wittig, Die Ulster-Frage in der anglo-irischen Literatur. — Id. 28, 4/6. April-Juni 1940. G. Dierlamm, John Galsworthy als Dramatiker. — Id. 28, 7/9. Juli-Sept. 1940. H. Dietz, Englisches Rednertum im letzten Jahrhundert. — Id. 28, 10/12. Okt.-Dez. 1940. W. Herbert, Eric Linklater und die schottische Kulturbewegung.

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. LII, 1. March 1937. O. H. Moore, Shakespeare's deviations from *Romeus and Iuliet*. — M. Kelley, The theological dogma of *Paradise Lost*, III, 173-202. — P. B. Anderson, La Bruyère and Mrs. Crackenthorpe's *Female Tatler*. — R. W. Kenny, Ralph's Case of *Authors*: its influence on Goldsmith and Isaac D'Israeli. — I. L. Churchill, Shenstone's *Billets*. — B. H. Bronson, Ritson's *Bibliographia Scotica*. — G. H. Orians, Censure of Fiction in American romances and magazines, 1789-1810. — H. MacMullan, The satire of Walker's *Vagabond* on Rousseau and Godwin. — N. P. Stallknecht, Wordsworth's *Ode to Duty* and the Schöne Seele. — I. J. Kapstein, Shelley and Cabanis. — K. Forward, "Libellous Attack" on De Quincey. — Id. LII, 2. June 1937. T. H. Banks, Spenser's *Rosalind*: a conjecture. — R. Jenkins, Spenser with Lord Grey in Ireland. — H. H. Umbach, The rhetoric of Donne's sermons. — C. B. Woods, Notes on three of Fielding's plays. — J. W. Draper, The metrical tale in XVIII-century England. — R. W. Seitz, The Irish background of Goldsmith's social and political thought. — B. R. McElderry, Walton's *Lives* and Gillman's *Life of Coleridge*. — F. L. Jones, Hogg and *The Necessity of Atheism*. — A. L. Strout, James Hogg's forgotten satire, *John Paterson's Mare*. — P. Landis, The *Waverley Novels*, or a hundred years after. — T. McDowell, Bryant's practice in composition and revision. — A. A. Kern, Hawthorne's *Feathertop* and R. L. R. — J. E. Englekirk, *My Nightmare*. The last tale by Poe. — A. R. Favreau, British criticism of Daudet, 1872-97. — C. Decker, Victorian comment on Russian realism. — A. W. Kelley, Literary theories about program music. — Id. LII, 3. Sept. 1937. R. B. Gottfried, Spenser's *View and Essex*. — P. K. Angell, Light on the Dark Lady: a study of some Elizabethan libels. — J. S. Diekhoff, The text of *Comus*, 1634 to 1645. — G. McColley, Milton's Dialogue on Astronomy: the principal immediate sources. — L. Cooper, Dr. Johnson on oats and other grains. — J. H. Warner, Eighteenth-century English reactions to the *Nouvelle Héloïse*. — V. M. Hamm, A seventeenth-century French source for Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*. — R. T. Fitzhugh, Burns' Highland Mary. — N. P. Stallknecht, Nature and imagination in Wordsworth's Meditation upon Mt. Snowdon. — O. Cargill, Nemesis and Nathaniel Hawthorne. — E. Peairs, The Hound, the Bay Horse, and the Turtle-Dove: a study of Thoreau and Voltaire. — R. C. Child, Swinburne's mature standards of criticisms. — Id. LII, 4. Dec. 1937. F. Bracher, Understatement in Old English poetry. — K. Hukanir, Equine quartering in *The Owl and the Nightingale*. — V. Shull, Clerical drama in Lincoln Cathedral, 1318 to 1561. — V. L. Dedek-Héry, Jean de Meun et Chaucer, traducteurs de la *Consolation* de Boèce. — D. T. Starnes, Bilingual dictionaries of Shakespeare's day. — F. B. Williams, Jr., Henry Parrot's stolen feathers. — G. K. Chalmers, Effluvia, the history of a metaphor. — J. B. Douds, Donne's technique of dissonance. — K. M. Lynch, Henrietta, Duchess of Marlborough. — F. R. Scott, Sir Robert Howard as a financier. — C. DeWith Thorpe, Addison and some of his predecessors on "novelty". — J. F. Doering, Hume and the theory of tragedy. — G. W. Whiting, Conrad's revision of "The Lighthouse" in *Nostromo*. — Id. LII, 1937.

Supplement. American Bibliography for 1937. — **Id.** LIII, 1. March 1938. U. T. Holmes, Jr., Old French *Mangon*. Anglo-Saxon *Mancus*, Late Latin *Mancussus*, *Mancosus*, *Mancessus*, etc. — K. Young, Chaucer's "Troilus and Criseyde" as romance. — J. R. Kreuzer, The Twelve Profits of Anger. — M. G. Frampton, The date of the "Wakefield Master": bibliographical evidence. — B. M. Wagner, New poems by Sir Philip Sidney. — S. R. Watson, Sidney at Bartholomew Fair. — D. J. McGinn, A new date for *Antonio's Revenge*. — H. D. Smith, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. — R. Lamson, Jr., Henry Purcell's dramatic songs and the English broadside ballad. — R. G. Noyes, Conventions of song in Restoration tragedy. — J. E. Wells, *Lyrical Ballads*, 1800: cancel leaves. — C. R. Sanders, Maurice as a commentator on Coleridge. — F. W. Lorch, Thoreau and the organic theory in poetry. — A. Whitridge, Matthew Arnold and Sainte-Beuve. — C. J. Weber, Chronology in Hardy's novels. — **Id.** LIII, 2. H. W. Wells, The philosophy of Piers Plowman. — R. Jenkins, Spenser: the uncertain years 1584-1589. — J. M. French, Milton's family bible. — F. S. Tupper, Mary Palmer, alias Mrs. Andrew Marvell. — R. D. Williams, Antiquarian interest in Elizabethan drama before Lamb. — D. R. Tuttle, *Christabel* sources in Percy's *Reliques* and the Gothic romance. — A. B. Hopkins, Mrs. Gaskell in France. — G. Jameson, Irish poets of today and Blake. — **Id.** LIII, 3. Sept. 1938. G. W. Stone, Jr., An interpretation of the A-text of *Piers Plowman*. — W. R. Ringer, The immediate source of Euphuism. — C. A. Greer, The place of *I Henry VI* in the York-Lancaster tetralogy. — W. M. Evans, Henry Lawes and Charles Cotton. — P. H. Gray, Jr., Lenten casts and the nursery: evidence for the dating of certain restoration plays. — L. J. Mills, The friendship theme in Orrery's plays. — C. E. Ward, The publication and profits of Dryden's *Virgil*. — W. C. Brown, Prose fiction and English interest in the Near East, 1775-1825. — C. R. Decker, The æsthetic revolt against naturalism in Victorian criticism. — E. A. Robinson, Meredith's literary theory and science: realism versus the Comic Spirit. — **Id.** LIII, 4. Dec. 1938. C. Brown, *Beowulf* and the *Blickling Homilies* and some textual notes. — I. Linn, If all the sky were parchment. — D. C. Allen, Science and invention in Greene's prose. — A. Thaler, Shakespeare on style, imagination and poetry. — E. L. Parker, The cursus in Sir Thomas Browne. — K. M. Lynch, Congreve's Irish friend, Joseph Keally. — L. Shapiro, Lucretian "domestic melancholy" and the tradition of Vergilian "frustration". — H. Drennon, James Thomson and John Norris. — D. Wecter, The missing years in Edmund Burke's biography. — W. Thorp, Redburn's prosy old guidebook. — R. C. Child, Is Walter Pater an impressionistic critic? — H. Penzl, The vowel in *rather* in New England. — **Id.** LIII, 1938. Supplement. American Bibliography for 1938. — **Id.** LIV, 1. March 1939. S. M. Kuhn, The dialect of the *Corpus Glossary*. — B. F. Huppé, *Piers Plowman* and the Norman wars. — A. Mizener, Character and action in the case of Criseyde. — B. D. Brown, Marlowe, Faustus, and Simon Magus. — K. T. Rowe, The Countess of Pembroke's editorship. — E. Brennecke, Jr., Shakespeare's collaboration with Morley. — J. R. Moore, A reply and a symposium. — E. Brennecke, Jr. Postscript. — J. S. Diekhoff, Milton's prosody in the Trinity MS. — T. W. Copeland, Burke and Dodsley's *Annual Register*. — W. Sypher, Chatterton's *African Eclogues* and the deluge. — D. L. Clark, Shelley and Shakespeare. — C. K. Hyder, Wilkie Collins and *The Woman in White*. — J. Prescott, James Joyce: a study in words. — G. Crotty, *The Exeter Harrowing of Hell*. — H. Braddy, Chaucer and Graunson: the Valentine tradition. — R. N. Robbins, The Gurney series of religious lyrics. — W. M. Evans, *To Splendora*. — J. C. Hodges, Fresh MS. sources for a Life of William Congreve. — G. W. Stone, Jr., *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the hands of Garrick and Colman. — T. M. Raysor, Coleridge's criticism of Wordsworth. — K. Forward, De Quincey's *Cessio Bonorum*. — K. L. Knickerbocker, Browning's letters to Isabella Blagden. — M. Thalmann, Hans Breitmann. — **Id.** LIV, 3. Sept. 1939. E. Birney, The beginnings of Chaucer's irony. — R. S. Loomis, Malory's Beaumains. — W. R. Parker, The sonnets in *Tottel's Miscellany*. — A. Harbage, Elizabethan acting. — W. W. Lawrence, Hamlet and the Mouse-Trap. — J. H. Neumann, Notes on Ben Jonson's English. — W. M. Evans, Lawes' and Lovelace's

Loose Saraband. — P. B. Anderson, Bernard Mandeville on gin. — J. H. Smith, Shelley and Claire Clairmont. — A. K. Tuell, Carlyle's marginalia in Sterling's *Essays and Tales*. — N. F. Doubleday, Hawthorne's Hester and feminism. — F. M. Smith, Mrs. Browning's rhymes. — *Id.* LIV. 4, Dec. 1939. R. H. Robbins, *The Speculum Misericordie*. — D. C. Boughner, The background of Lyly's Tophas. — C. E. Mounts, Spenser's seven bead-men and the corporal works of mercy. — H. C. Baker, Classical material in broadside ballads. — G. E. Noyes, Some interrelations of English dictionaries. — S. B. Ewing, Jr., Burton, Ford, and *Andromana*. — E. N. S. Thompson, *The Temple* and *The Christian Year*. — A. H. Gilbert, "A Double Janus" (*Paradise Lost* XI. 129). — D. L. Gilbert and R. Pope, The Cowper translation of Mme Guyon's poems. — J. P. Emery, Murphy's criticisms in the *London Chronicle*. — H. E. Spivey, Poe and Lewis Gaylord Clark. — J. G. Eaker, Robert Bridges' concept of nature. — *Id.* LIV. 1939. Supplement. American Bibliography for 1939. — *Id.* LV, 1, March 1940. Romanticism: a Symposium. 3: H. N. Fairchild, England. — 6: E. Nitchie, England. — W. J. Entwistle, Notation for ballad melodies. — E. M. Hinton, Rych's *Anothomy of Ireland*. — J. M. French, "That late villain Milton." — M. Kelley, Addendum: the later career of Daniel Skinner. — R. A. Brower, Dryden's epic manner and Virgil. — D. Wexler, Burke's theory of words, images, and emotion. — A. L. Strout, John Wilson and the "Orphan-Maid": some unpublished letters. — J. L. Lowes, *The Witch of Atlas* and *Endymion*. — M. B. Cramer, Browning's friendships and fame before marriage (1833-1846). — E. R. Davis, Dickens and the evolution of caricature. — C. C. Walcutt, The three stages of Theodore Dreiser's naturalism. — *Id.* LV, 2, June 1940. E. K. Henningham, Old English precursors of *The Worcester Fragments*. — A. A. Hill, Early loss of [r] before dentals. — R. A. Houk, Versions of Lindsay's *Satire of the Three Estates*. — W. G. Zeeveld, Richard Morison, official apologist for Henry VIII. — W. H. Rogers, The significance of Fielding's *Temple Beau*. — M. R. Adams, Mary Hays disciple of William Godwin. — C. S. Brown, Jr., More Swinburne-d'Annunzio parallels. — *Id.* LV, 3, Sept. 1940. C. S. Brown, Jr., Beowulf's arm-lock. — R. Taylor, John Shakespeare, Corviser, of Stratford-on-Avon and the Balsall Shakespeares. — F. Hard, Richard Haydocke and Alexander Browne: two half-forgotten writers on the art of painting. — J. S. Finch, Early drafts of *The Garden of Cyrus*. — J. S. Diekhoff, Critical activity of the poetic mind: John Milton. — T. H. Banks, The banquet scene in *Paradise Regained*. — J. F. Ross, The character of Poor Richard: its source and alteration. — C. R. Sanders, Sir Leslie Stephen, Coleridge, and two Coleridgeans. — J. H. Pershing, Keats: when was he born and when did he die? — E. F. Haden and E. A. Joliat, Le genre grammatical des substantifs en Franco-Canadien empruntés à l'anglais. — L. Dennis, The progressive tense: frequency of its use in English. — S. Thompson, Folklore and literature. — Br. A. Philip, The Exeter scribe and the unity of the *Crist*. — W. G. Zeeveld, A Tudor defense of Richard III. — V. F. Hopper, Spenser's "House of Temperance." — E. E. Stoll, Poetry and the passions: an aftermath. — T. P. Haviland, The early Freneau's debt to Milton. — W. F. Gallaway, Jr., The conservative attitude toward fiction, 1770-1830. — F. B. Evans III, Thomas Taylor, Platonist. — J. E. Wells, Wordsworth and De Quincey in Westmorland politics, 1818. — F. M. Smith, Whitman's poet-prophet and Carlyle's hero. — C. Gohdes, Longfellow and his authorized British publishers.

Zola and the American Public

In its article on the Centenary of Emile Zola last year *The Times Literary Supplement* states that "the writing of his that most readily springs to the lips when he is mentioned [today] is not any of his thirty-odd novels but a newspaper article entitled 'J'Accuse!' in which he took up the cause of Captain Dreyfus". And the writer follows out this conception of Zola as the fighting moralist of his age, to the detriment of the artist and novelist, with much convincing force. Zola, the writer explains, "was driven to become the focus of his age, its expression and its interpreter, in order that he might help to make it anew. But this is an ambition which the politician, the preacher, the orator, the publicist, the educator, the social historian may follow as well as the novelist, and indeed with less risk of violating their medium". For Zola had debased his art by obstinately refusing to be satisfied with the mere telling of a story and had devoted himself to social analysis instead, thereby calling down upon himself the wrath of the gods that watch over the arts and losing the gift of literary creation that he possessed; just at the moment when he needed it most to carry through his largest plan, the Three Cities and the Four Gospels. And so the Zola of posterity, our Zola, is the Zola, not of the Rougon-Macquart novels, but of the Dreyfus case, essentially the moral politician and hero of a great political crisis.

There is certainly a great deal of truth in this conception, at least so far as the Anglo-Saxon world, for which the article was written, is concerned. But the slight doubt that lurks between the lines of the article becomes considerably stronger when one turns one's eyes towards the world to which Zola himself belonged. In France his literary influence is past and the panoramic novels of Roger Martin du Gard and others probably owe more to Balzac and Flaubert than directly to Zola. And hardly more than one or two of the Rougon-Macquart series count today among the books read by the cultivated French public. But in the lower strata of literate society the case is obviously different, as an examination of the sales figures of various volumes of the cheap yellow edition of the novels shows. According to these statistics, in the twenty years' period between 1908 and 1929 more than a million copies of Zola's books were sold. A certain percentage of these may have gone outside the borders of France — to the colonies, to Germany and Italy, to America. But the fact remains that for a full generation after his death Zola retained his position as the greatest best-seller of his country. That is hardly an argument against his powers as a story-teller! To be sure, the great mass of these sales are concentrated on the Rougon-Macquart series, of which more than 850000 copies were sold — at an average of more than 40000 per volume. While of the last

two series, the Three Cities and the Four Gospels, only 168000 are listed, averaging about 28000 per volume. The appeal of these books, which are recognizably weaker as novels, was obviously less than that of the earlier ones, which are generally accepted as Zola's best work. Among them his masterpieces rank high in the sales statistics, too: *La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret*, *L'Assommoir*, *Une Page d'Amour* and *Germinal* sold about 60000 copies each, while *Le Rêve* reached 66000 and *Nana* 69000. It is clear that Zola's story-telling power was considerably greater — at least in the popular mind — than the critics and at times he himself were willing to admit.

However, that is not the whole tale, for the one volume of the Rougon-Macquart series that sold twice as much as any of the others was *La Terre*, with a sales figure of 129000. There is no artistic quality in this novel that would warrant such an enormous difference in popularity and the only possible conclusion is that it was the matter of the book and in particular the shock-value of many of the scenes that Zola chose to regard as typical of life in the countryside of France that attracted so many readers. The book is notoriously unveiled and moves close enough along the edge of outright pornography for the untrained reader, who has only a slight sense of the art that went even into this work of the novelist, to accept it as such. This pornographic quality, which is all the more dubious as it is grotesquely false in its aim, is, however, only the strongest and most concentrated expression of a tendency that is characteristic of most of the others of Zola's novels, and there is no doubt that a certain degree of his posthumous popularity as evidenced in the statistical figures above is due to the salty quality of his stories. Compared to the literature of our own day, Zola's licence in situation and description is tame; but when they appeared, the notoriety of his novels was an essential and intentional part of their effect.

There is thus a factor involved in the advent of Zola's novels in America that is usually overlooked. American society, like that of France and England before it, felt itself attacked and was bound to defend what it naturally regarded as some of the fundamental principles of morality. Mere aesthetics would hardly have raised the storm and continued the battle that raged for more than a decade in the Anglo-Saxon countries and was not laid till the Dreyfus affair showed to the English-speaking world the "real" Zola. There was a more tangible, a more real, actually a sociological problem involved, for in America especially thousands of volumes of Zola's books were being distributed at cheap prices and read all over the country. Had the French novelist's public been restricted to the select few that had the care and cultivation of literary taste in their keeping, the battle, if there had been one, would not have been so fierce or so prolonged. Actually, the best writers in America were quick to recognize his high qualities. But since Zola passed the accepted arbiters by and appealed straight to the masses — unintentionally, to be sure, — his novels were a social menace and were combated as such. It was not till his moral character was

gradually recognized and finally convincingly vindicated that he won general acceptance.

At the famous trial of Vizetelly, Zola's courageous English publisher complained that he had been urged to the publication of the French novelist's work in England by the prevalence of cheap American editions in the market that were only a travesty of the originals and a grave distortion of the serious intentions of the author.¹ The purveyor of these cheap American editions, the first and for more than ten years the chief publisher of Zola in the English language, was the firm of T. B. Peterson & Brothers, of Philadelphia. It was one of the many American printing and publishing houses that took advantage of the then condition of the copyright law and did a thriving business in reprinting the outstanding books and authors of Europe free of any cost to themselves so far as royalties were concerned. It was a condition of affairs that many an English author and not a few foreign ones complained of bitterly and it was not remedied till well into the present century, when, largely due to the influence of Mark Twain, a law was passed protecting the rights of foreign authors in the United States. During the eighties, however, literary piracy was a legitimate occupation and among the authors of the firm of Peterson we find, besides Scott and Dickens, Charles Lever and Edward Bulwer, Captain Marryat, G. P. R. James and Harrison Ainsworth, Wilkie Collins and Thackeray's daughter, such French authors as Alexandre Dumas, Eugène Sue and George Sand. Hence Zola was in fairly good company, though Balzac and his own generation of realists were missing.

The translator was Mary Neal Sherwood, a lady about whom practically nothing is known. She was obviously a hack-writer of the firm, working on a commission and furnishing her employers with copy from the French authors popular at the time. She had done translations of Octave Feuillet and Mme. Dussaud and had Englished half a dozen novels by Henri Gréville before she tried her hand at Zola, beginning with *Une Page d'Amour*, which she produced as *Hélène. A Love Episode*, in 1878. It was the first English rendering of a novel by the great naturalist. The next year *The Abbé's Temptation* appeared, re-issued during 1880 with a new title-page as *Albine, or The Abbé's Temptation*. But both editions were now published as by John Stirling; Mrs. Sherwood, obviously cowed by the effects of her first venture, had retreated into pseudonymity, as the 1882 edition of *Hélène* shows, which is also signed John Stirling. Henceforth this remained the nom-de-plume of Peterson & Brothers' translator.

Between 1878 and 1884 she turned fourteen of Zola's novels into English. After the auspicious beginning with *Une Page d'Amour* the year 1879 was the most productive, witnessing the appearance of no less than five books: *The Abbé's Temptation*, *L'Assommoir*, *The Conquest of Plassans*, *The*

¹ Vizetelly, Zola. p. 242 f.: "The earliest versions of Zola's novels in our language offered for sale in Great Britain were of American . . . in . . . for the most part ridiculous, full of errors, and so denuded by excisions and alterations as to give no idea of what the books might be like in French".

Markets of Paris and *The Rougon-Macquart Family*. In 1880 there were three: *Clorinda* (Eugène Rougon), *Magdalen Férat* and *Nana*, followed in 1881 by only one — *Thérèse Raquin* — in 1882 by two: *In the Whirlpool* (*La Curée*) and *Pot-Bouille*, in 1883 by one — *Bonheur des Dames* — and winding up in 1884 with *Joys of Life*. It was, on the whole, a large production and argues a rising market for the firm, who called in a second translator to keep the output up to the demand. George D. Cox, as unknown as the lady, was not so prolific as she, but he did seven translations between 1882 and 1890: *Claude's Confession* and *The Mysteries of Marseilles* in 1882, *Her Two Husbands and other Novelettes* (*Le Capitaine Burle*) in 1883, *The Jolly Parisiennes and other Novelettes* (*Naïs Micoulin*), *La Terre* and *Le Rêve* in 1888 and *La Bête Humaine* in 1890.

With these twenty-one books, and an anonymous translation of *L'Œuvre* under the title of *Christine the Model; or Studies of Love* — a list which included all the Rougon-Macquart series up to date except *Germinal* — Peterson & Bros. were far and away the leading publishers of Zola in America during the eighties, though they had not actually cornered the market. The same freedom from payment of royalties that they enjoyed was open to others and competitors began to appear comparatively early. In 1879, simultaneously with Petersons, the New York firm of G. W. Carleton & Co. brought out a translation of *L'Assommoir* under the title of *Gervaise (L'Assommoir). The Natural and Social Life of a Family under the Second Empire. A Novel*. Both books are practically identical in size — 380 pp. and 381 pp. — and one might suspect a certain lack of chivalry among these knights of the road, if it were not for the Carletons' asseveration that their book was "translated from the 60th Paris edition by Edward Binsse". This remained, however, their sole inroad on the Petersons' domain; but in 1882 a more formidable rival appeared in the New York firm of F. Tousey, who published the Brookside Library and brought out *La Confession de Claude* as *A Terrible Confession; or, The Sufferings of a Lost Soul in a Garret*. The translation was by Horace Townsend and the purchaser received a quarto pamphlet of twenty-nine pages to read by his brook. In 1884 Tousey followed up with *The Two Duchesses. A Story of To-day* Translated from the French by Myron A. Cooney. And in 1885 the same translator signed for a third Zola-venture of Tousey's, namely *The Mysteries of Marseilles*, which was declared to be "the latest edition, rewritten and revised by the author". All three publications were in the quarto format of the Brookside collection, but with the third the publisher dropped out of the running, which two other champions of literature had meanwhile entered. In 1882 Petersons had brought out a new issue of *Clorinda*, their rendering of *Eugène Rougon*, under a new title: *The Mysteries of the Court of Louis Napoleon*. With only a slight change the same title graced a translation of the same original in 1884, signed for by Kenward Philip and published by the New York firm of N. L. Munro, as *The Mysteries of Louis Napoleon's Court*. In the same way Peterson's *The Joys of Life* found its counterpart in Munro's

Life's Joys, in the same year 1884, done by the same translator. And in 1885 Belford, Clark & Co., of New York and Chicago, published *Germinal* in a translation by one Carlynne. That was the last attempt to dispute the supremacy of the Petersons in the Zola market.

The first phase of the publishers' battle for Zola had thus ended in a victory for our heroes of Philadelphia. The second began with the advent of a new champion on the field in the persons of Laird and Lee, a Chicago firm. At the end of the eighties they had a similarly dominant position as the Petersons had had ten years earlier, at least so far as the list of their publications went. Between 1888 and 1891 they published twelve of Zola's books, including eleven of those already got out by Petersons and the new novel, *Money*, which had only recently appeared in French. About this time the Peterson firm disappears from view; it seems to have been absorbed by the Royal Publishing Company, also of Philadelphia, who took over Mary Sherwood's translations. The latter were still in the market as late as 1912, when they dropped out completely.² It seems clear that at the beginning of the nineties Petersons had exhausted their interest in Zola, leaving the field to a younger and stronger firm working with more energy and to better advantage in the Middle West.

Petersons had been perfectly frank in their bid for popularity and large sales. The volumes were of cheap paper, with yellow paper covers in imitation of the notorious originals, often with a picture, and cost from twenty-five to seventy-five cents, rarely more. It was entirely in line with their purpose, however, carefully to avoid any suggestion of pruriency in their undertaking and to stress, in the manner of Defoe and Richardson, their high moral aims. A revolting picture of vice as a warning is, in their view, Zola's object and implicitly their own in reproducing his books. That had obviously not been realized by the readers of the first two translations, so *L'Assommoir* was issued in 1879 with a preface on Zola and his peculiar conceptions of art and the novel. It is in the nature of a manifesto, the first statement of its kind in English, and not without some interest, though substantially it repeats the now well-known theory of "naturalism". "These novels", John Stirling says, "were the result of long study and careful observation, of notes taken down on the spot, interspersed with phrases and bits of dialogue, inscribed as they fell hot from the lips of the speaker — of physiological studies — and extracts from medical reports. Zola's way of working is peculiar. He selects a subject — his plot being quite a secondary consideration. To work out this subject he spares no pains — he studies it all in its minutest details. If he wants a character or a class for a book, he goes out and looks for it, accepting no report at second hand. The end and aim of M. Zola is to make all art — dramatic, narrative and pictorial — only another word for Nature, so that it may tend to a moral end, as all great writers invariably tend by their own proper force. It has been rather the fashion in this country to drop

² From information kindly furnished by Mr. Arnold K. Borden of the U. of Pa. Library.

the voice and shrug the shoulders when Zola's name is heard, as if he were the prophet of all uncleanness. But this is sheer ignorance and lack of appreciation of the real meaning of Zola's works. Never once does this author make vice attractive. He paints it in all its hideous reality, and unquestionably calls 'a spade a spade'. He says distinctly: 'Thus and thus do men and women behave under certain circumstances'. His text, on which he preaches in *L'Assommoir*, is drunkenness, and true to his theory and manner of looking at a subject, M. Zola does not content himself with showing its defects on the moral nature alone, but goes still further, and gives a ghastly, appalling picture of this repulsive and disgusting vice. We close the volume faint and sick at heart, as we realize how many women in our land are made as wretched as Gervaise, and how many homes are blighted by this terrible evil. As a picture of the woe and degradation springing from drunkenness, *L'Assommoir* is without a rival in modern fiction".

It is clear that Mary Sherwood knew her subject and there is no cause to doubt her sincerity. She spoke publicly in 1879 what men like Howells and James were thinking and writing privately. But the firm is not so free from suspicion. At first they were probably sincere in their moralistic attitude. In a special advertising preface printed at the head of *L'Assommoir* they say that the translation "has been toned down to suit the American reading public" and that "vice is never made attractive". That is true enough; in fact, it had to be so in order to avoid the intervention of the law. But this high line was obviously abandoned when, a few years later, some of the volumes were re-issued under new titles. The titles show the change of spirit. Thus the simple *Hélène. A Love Episode*, of 1878 is changed in 1882 to *Hélène. A Tale of Love and Passion*; the quiet *The Conquest of Plassans. A Tale of Provincial Life*, became the lurid *A Mad Love*; or, *The Abbé and his Court*, a few years later; *The Markets of Paris* was turned into *La Belle Lisa*; or *The Paris Market-Girls*, and still later into *The Flower and Market-Girls of Paris*; and the documentary *Clorinda*; or *The Rise and Reign of his Excellency Eugene Rougon*, was heightened into the romantic *The Mysteries of the Court of Louis Napoleon*. The most startling improvement in this direction was, however, the re-issue in 1882 of *The Rougon-Macquart Family* as *The Girl in Scarlet*. The tone is distinctly low and a critic in a popular literary weekly, *The Literary World*; reviewing *The Mysteries of Marseilles* in 1884, to which Petersons had added the sub-title: *The Loves of Blanche and Phillipe*, comments that "the title of the book is salaciously suggestive of far more evil things" than are contained in it. "What a terrible responsibility", he adds, "is taken by those who, for money, pander to the lowest tastes in human nature". (*Lit. World*, Nov. 29, 1884. p. 420.) The change was probably due to the growing competition of other firms and to the fact that the later issues were carried out to the villages and open country and sold by book-agents to the farmers and their families, who may have needed more robust stimulants to part with their quarters

and half-dollars. The sale was very large; that was the universal impression, though no statistics are available.³ In the summer of 1888, when Zola was made a knight of the Legion of Honor, sellers of his books were arrested and under trial "by wholesale" in Tennessee as purveyors of indecent literature (*The Critic*, July 21, 1888, p. 35). His popularity and his reputation for salaciousness went together, and Petersons did their bit in both fields. As late as 1894 a "Boston Letter" in *The Critic* reports that "Zola has stirred up the good people of Boston this week by a rumor that the Custom House has refused to admit one of his novels". And the Trustees of the famous Boston Public Library "allow very few of Zola's books to be circulated, while those supposed to be most immoral are marked with the stars that forbid their use without the permission of the Board of Trustees". (*Critic*, July 14, 1894, p. 28.)

For this development the translator can hardly be made responsible and it may have led to her finally retiring from cooperation with the publisher. The translation itself, however, was her work. In the prefatory note to *L'Assommoir* the publisher modestly claimed that the adaptation of the French original to American taste had been accomplished "with literary ability, combined with tact, delicacy and refinement" and that the translator "has done his work in such an able and thorough manner, that it seems almost incredible it could have been written other than in English". In view of the actual facts the effrontery of the "blurb" is only matched by its naïveté, for Mary Sherwood's production is not, properly speaking, a translation at all! Merely the barest outlines of the sequence of events are given, only the most meagre elements of description, and the essential quality of Zola's work, the lights and shades on the surfaces, the colour, the atmosphere, the all-important milieu is completely lost. Whole paragraphs are reduced to one or two sentences, whole speeches cut down to a few words, and these often as inept as they can be. The vitally important tone that is embodied in the various shades of Parisian argot, of French slang, has evaporated and in its place is left a weak, listless and colorless English that handles even what is left of the original text with complete freedom, supplanting French expressions with English ones of an entirely different meaning and adding summarily stock English phrases that have nothing to do with Zola's words. Mary Sherwood's intentions were obviously infinitely higher than her powers, and her knowledge of French was probably not greater than that of any other "educated" American lady of her day and entirely inadequate to her task, not to speak of her complete lack of any literary talent. Merely a short investigation corroborates most forcibly Vizetelly's complaints, and the only wonder is that such vapid clap-trap should have been regarded as dangerous, as

³ In 1880 a writer in the *North American Review* (vol. 131, p. 79 f., July) complained that Zola's books were not only displayed in the fashionable book-stores, but were seen everywhere in drawing-rooms and were even tolerated as "family-reading". But these were probably French editions.

undoubtedly was the case. One reviewer did express his surprise in this respect and candidly admits that "in its present form the work (*L'Assommoir*) hardly shows the exceptional realistic power claimed for it". (*Lit. World* 1879, p. 202.)

When Laird and Lee began their publication of Zola's novels in 1888 they had Vizetelly's British renderings as a model and a standard. To be sure, even Vizetelly found it necessary to edit his translations and to avoid the harsher realistic effects, but his aims were truly artistic and his attainment as complete as was possible at the time. The American publishers now pointedly mention on their title-pages that their translations have also been edited — Laird and Lee's "editor" was Edward Wharton Chalmers — and, though even now the books appeared in a popular series — The Pastime Series of Laird and Lee — and cost from twenty-five cents to a dollar, the publishers claim in some cases that their translation has been authorized by Zola himself. Laird and Lee actually fought out their claim in court when it was challenged by Rand, McNally & Co., of New York, who also had published an "authorized" edition of *The Dream* in 1888. The Chicago firm maintained that Zola had given the authorization to their translator, one Count Edgar de Valcour Vermont, and they won their case; Rand, McNally dropped out of the Zola-publishing business. But there were others still in it for its popularity and profits — seven firms were publishing Zola between 1890 and 1895 — and occasionally a cheap title went with the cheap price — in 1892 *Thérèse Raquin* appeared as *The Devil's Compact. A Vivid Translation from the French.* —; but the general trend was now decidedly upward. Vizetelly's books were by this time rapidly supplanting the make-shift renderings of former years, and when in 1894 the Cassel Publishing Co. of New York printed *Le Roman Expérimental* as *The Experimental Novel* in a translation by Belle M. Sherman and in 1894 Heath & Co. brought out an abridged school edition of *La Débâcle*, Zola could be regarded as having come definitely into his own as a recognized literary force.

* *

The dominant note in American criticism of Zola was naturally one of repulsion. It is not difficult to gather a mass of quotations illustrating the disgust of the great majority of American critics at the material Zola made use of in his novels; it has, in fact, been done with sufficient completeness by Mr. Herbert Edwards in *American Literature*.⁴ The anti-Zola campaign began, even before the American editions were on the scene, with the appearance of *L'Assommoir* in Paris in the spring of 1877. On March 15 of that year the New York *Nation* printed the first criticism of Zola in America and its final judgment was: "*L'Assommoir* left in me an impression of anger and disgust". (Edwards, p. 114.) A few months later the same

⁴ Vol. IV. No. 2, p. 114 ff. (May 1932). I gratefully acknowledge the use of some of his material in this essay.

book produced the same result in *The Atlantic Monthly*; the reviewer laid the book down with "physical repulsion". (*Atl. Mo.* vol. 39, p. 762 [June 1877.]) And the note thus struck was retained with redoubled force after the American editions began to appear. In 1880 Thomas Sergeant Perry in *The Atlantic*: "(Zola's) books are more shameless and disgusting than anything in modern literature — covering his pages with so complete an assortment of indecencies that there is nothing left for those that come after him". In 1884 Harper's Monthly Magazine: "... The Works of M. Zola, the apotheosis of immorality". (February p. 477.) In 1887 *The Critic*: "... the great apostle of the filthy school, Emile Zola." (Sept. 10, p. 132.) In 1891 *The Literary World*; now, however, with a note of concession: "(Zola) performs in the field of literature the office of the spreader of malodorous fertilizers". (p. 141.) And even as late as 1895 *The Catholic World*, with a sigh of genuine relief: "Zola knew his end was near — people were tired of his filth." (p. 357 ff.)

In all this there undoubtedly was a large measure of pure — or impure! — Philistinism. The Gilded Age was clinging to its guilt and we know now the power it had over the best minds of the time. Mr. Edwards truly says: "The period was an inauspicious one for the pronounced and somewhat brutal realism of Zola". But it could with not a little justification say for itself that it had the right to repel a deliberate attack on its sensibilities; from the point of view of a fair fight the American attitude, though not higher, certainly was not lower than that taken up by the majority of critics in Europe.⁵ That there was a new conception of art demanding recognition in Zola's work, the American critics realized at once. Zola based his claim on the truth of his depiction of life, implying that in its truth lay its artistic value. The Americans immediately denied the claim. "He says this novel is the chastest of his books", the critic of *L'Assommoir* in the *Atlantic* reported, "and he adds that it is also true. Now that is something wholly beside the question. There are a great many things in human nature which cannot be told, however truly". And the critic mentions street noises and the buzzing of a saw as examples of inartistic material. In 1882 a critic in the *Literary World*, reviewing *Pot-Bouille* under the caption "Zola's Stink-Pot", and referring to his famous observations, says: "We would no more willingly apply the term art to them than to a microscopic examination of a pailful of sewage". (*Lit. World*, June 3, 1882.) A few weeks later, describing the epic material of *The Mysteries of Marseilles*, the same critic exclaims ironically: "Charming ingredients for a work of art, truly!" (Aug. 12, 1882.) And in the autumn of the same year *La Fortune des Rougon* occasioned the same kind of stricture on the elements of Zola's epics: "In and of themselves they are no more than many other unpleasant things which cultivated people are glad to ignore. Since M. Zola fails to evolve from them any higher meaning, it is not easy to discover the value of his so-called studies. That crime begets

⁵ cf. W. C. Frierson, *The English Controversy over Realism in Fiction*, P.M.L.A. vol. 43.

crime, we all know. If the mission of the fiction of the future is no more than to teach us this, then M. Zola may well style himself its master". (*Lit. World*, Nov. 4, 1882.) It is the conception of art as a selection from life, separating artistic from inartistic material as a first condition of artistic creation. From such a point of view Zola's books were truly a "shameless assault on every principle of literature which distinguishes a novel as a work of art from a criminal indictment". (*Atl. Mo.* vol. 39, p. 761.) Three years later the *Atlantic* made the same defence: "Zola's novels find their most formidable rivals in the criminal reports of a daily newspaper", and in the same year Perry, in the review of *Nana* quoted above (*Atl. Mo.* vol. 45, p. 693), says vehemently: "All laws of art are as dear to him as the synagogue was to a crusader". As late as 1888 the *Atlantic* reiterated its thesis: "It will be a fortunate day for art, and for the novel in particular, when the French shall have finished their exhaustive labors in the sewer, and reached the level of the pavements". (*Atl. Mo.* vol. 62, p. 711.)⁶

Once the ground he stood on was denied him, Zola's personal capacity as an artist could easily be called in question. Perry, in the article quoted, makes no bones of the matter. "Zola's collection of facts may be complete and exact", he says, "but the way he has put them together is clumsy in the extreme. When he writes a novel that is something like the conventional story such as *Une Page d'Amour*, he is no better than any one else; only worthy of a second rate place among a great many skillful writers; simply a mediocre writer of a wearisome kind of novel." "He displays no extraordinary power in painting scenes of actual life," says A. K. Fiske in 1880 (*Profligacy in Fiction*, *No. Am. Rev.*, July 1880, vol. 131, p. 79 ff.). Of *Claude's Confession* *The Literary World* can say: "Its crudeness is nowhere relieved by imaginative beauty, and is only at times overwrought into sentimentalism of the hysterical order". (Nov. 8, 1882, p. 401.) This judgment was passed on the basis of the Peterson translation and may have been influenced by it. But the critic of *Germinal* in the same journal in 1885 had a full and comparatively adequate English text to go by and arrives substantially at the same conclusion. For him the novel consists of "laborious 'studies' of human depravities intermingled with interminable and wholly wearisome descriptions of mines and mining. Zola leaves nothing to the imagination, he puts down all that he knows and sometimes a good deal more". (*Lit. World*, Apr. 4, 1885, p. 113.) *The Critic* speaks of the "artistic falseness" of *Pot-Bouille* (May 6, 1882, p. 127), claiming that the "blacks are laid on with so heavy a hand that there is little or no white to be seen", while in *La Fortune des Rougon* "execution falls below conception; the reader is haunted continually by the thought that themes so full of natural beauty would have been treated by a genuine artist in a

⁶ In an article on The Morally Objectionable in Literature (*North American Review* Oct. 1882) O. B. Frothingham reduced the otherwise legitimate argument to mere Comstockery, directed chiefly against Boccaccio, Goethe and Walt Whitman, and mentioning Zola only in passing.

different and better way". (*Lit. World*, Nov. 4, 1882.) With the rich tradition of the English novel to support him, the American critic notes the total lack of humor in Zola, thus recognizing in him the fanatic — the one human type that appeals least to the Anglo-Saxon mind. "Zola has none of the saving grace of humor; he has a most un-French lack of esprit", said Brander Matthews in 1881, "and a little humor would do much toward clearing the atmosphere of its foulness". (*Lippincott's Mag.*, Apr. 1881, p. 383; also Perry in *International Rev.*, Feb. 1881, p. 144.) And a second cardinal point was his faulty psychology. Fiske in the *North American Review* (quoted above) had remarked on the mediocrity of Zola's power "in portraying human character, or in fathoming the feelings and motives of men". In 1882 a critic of *Claude's Confession* had recognized that his analysis of character was simply a painting of surfaces, that there was no natural development of motive from circumstance to deed and that his personages were really puppets that could not carry through a real plot. The death of Marie consequently remained "a sheer piece of brutality". (*Lit. World*, Nov. 18, 1882, p. 401.) And the critic of *Germinal*, mentioned above, remarks: "Of course one does not demand of M. Zola any representations of human nature as it really exists". It is essentially the same stricture that the reviewer of *The Markets of Paris* had suggested in 1879 when he said that Zola offered magnificent scene-painting but no drama, wardrobes but no hero. (*Lit. World*, 1879, p. 359.)

The photographic quality of Zola's work was naturally recognized very soon. Perry had said that "Zola's art is more like photography than any of the other methods of copying scenes", and the idea was taken up by others. His work is allowed to be artistic only in a certain sense. "It is in literature what the prosaic school of Dutch realists is in painting — a photographic reproduction of the markets", says one critic of *The Markets of Paris*. But that is not accepted as "high or noble art". "The true artist", says the critic, "portrays life, not merely costume, and life in any profound sense we do not find here". That touched the question of truth from another point of view, the problem of artistic truth, and from here there were not a few attacks on Zola and his artistic system. To begin with, Perry attempted to take the glamour from the whole movement by asserting that it was as old as the hills. "There is nothing new in the main principles of the naturalistic school, except their notion that they are scientific; although in their practice they are sufficiently bold in introducing comparative novelties. Men have studied Nature with more or less success for a long time; and when they forget this all-important rule — (namely, to study Nature!) — it is well that their attention should be recalled to it". But for Perry the imagination — the imagination of genius — divines the truth which eludes the keenest observation. (*Intern. Rev.*, Feb. 1881, p. 144.) But now even the photographic surface-truth of Zola's work could be called in question. For one thing, Fiske objected to the restriction of the term "realism" to only one, the unpleasant aspect of life. "This seamy side of things", he says (*No. Am. Rev.*, July 1880), "is no more real than

the other and its delineation no more 'realistic' in the sense given to that term". And for another, the realism he finds in *Nana*, the book under review, excites his suspicious disgust. "Men who go through the world with their eyes open", he remarks with considerable penetration, "and are capable of making those inferences in regard to character and experience which surface indications suggest, know that this book is replete with exaggeration. It does not describe the real life of the class whose type is its central figure with the sharp lines of truth. The picture is colossal in proportions and glaring in colors ... This huge fleshly Venus ... is a daring figment of the imagination, as much so as the witch that lured the companions of Ulysses to their swinish fate ... M. Zola has been writing on a theory, and, in following it out, he has left fact behind him with the ancestors of *Nana* ... As poetry, as ingenious fiction, it might pass; but its pretensions to reality are a sham". "We refuse to believe", says a reviewer of *Pot-Bouille*, "that the unhealthy and disreputable gang (portrayed in the book) are fairly representative of the 'middle class'. Most of the incidents, taken separately, are possible — it is in massing them together that the injustice lies". (*The Critic*, May 6, 1882. p. 127.) And another critic denies Zola even the consistency of his own thesis. "With all his philosophy, he is no philosopher nor logician. In the case of Zola there is nothing more unnatural than his naturalism". (*Critic*, Aug. 12, 1882, p. 215.) Which, of course, touched one of the essential points of the controversy about literary naturalism and one which was carefully examined by Prof. A. S. Hardy in the *Andover Review* of 1890 — with negative results for Zola! (*And. Rev.*, May 1890.)

It cannot be denied today that there is a great deal of truth in all this criticism of Zola's work and that posterity has substantially confirmed many of these objections in the abstract, though it would probably not accept in the concrete what most of his critics would have put in Zola's place. Still, in justice it must be said that Zola was not condemned wholesale, not even in the earlies. In 1879 *The Abbé's Temptation* received very fair treatment at the hands of *The Literary World*. Comparing it to *L'Assommoir*, the critic says it is "as unlike the former as a bed of roses is unlike the gutter", and for the problem involved he has a very real understanding and sympathy. "The conflicts which the soul may undergo have seldom been depicted with greater intensity and exuberance — some would say extravagance of imagination. The power in this original and striking tale is not to be denied; but" — he must needs add, — "it is far from being of a wholesome kind". (*Lit. World*, 1879, p. 202.) In the same way and the same place *The Conquest of Plassans* is treated with quiet appraisal (*ibid.* p. 326). Magdalen Férat is even favorably treated, her person recognized as being "more sinned against than sinning", — a character for Sarah Bernhardt, for which "Zola has certainly supplied the tragedy". (*Lit. World*, Nov. 6, 1880.) *Clorinda* (*Eugène Rougon*) is accepted as "outwardly decent if not inwardly pure"; "we will say this for Zola, that in this book he has managed to be as little offensive as it would

be possible to be in dealing with such a subject". And the critic praises the masterly hand, the wonderful combination of simplicity and power shown in the workmanship. "The author is still wading in the gutter", he adds, "but it is a gutter which runs around a palace, and the sewage of a court is, to say the least, scented". (*Lit. World*, Aug. 28, 1880, p. 295.) And even in a vehement condemnation of a book like *Pot-Bouille* the author of the "Stink-Pot" review has enough fairness to concede that Zola's descriptive powers are of a high order.

The moralistic point of view that determined all this adverse criticism and qualified the praise was inherent in the general conception of art that had come down from the classicism and romanticism of former generations. As one of the critics expressed it, "the mission of art is to please, to elevate the mind by appealing to the emotions on the noble side". (*Lit. World*, Nov. 18, 1882, p. 401.) It was the "use" of art to raise humanity to a higher plane and the practical mind of the average Anglo-Saxon could understand such an elevation only in the moral sense. That is what lies at the bottom of Perry's rather queer stricture as to Zola's "gentlemanliness". "One cannot help feeling", he says, "that Zola lacks more than anything, gentlemanliness. That is the trouble with him, he is irredeemably vulgar". (*Atl. Mo.*, 1880, p. 693.) The "gentleman" was Perry's and the *Atlantic's* ideal of humanity — "lady" being implicitly understood — and vulgarity was the greatest of sins in a cultured human being. Cultured human beings, however, were the world in which men like Perry lived and for which they wrote, and his indictment of Zola, strange as its form may appear today, had the very practical purpose of warning cultured Boston away from his books. "Degrading literature", says Frothingham in the *North American Review* in 1882 (*No. Am. Rev.* vol. 135, p. 336). "is confined to degraded people who can scarcely read at all, and who do not care to read books addressed to hearts or brains". In this shape the argument was pure Bostonese; but a good deal of this practical sociology lay at the back of most of the defensive war against Zola. Not only that more than one critic with the French original before him expressed the hope that the book would not be made accessible to American young people in an English translation, but the knowledge that so many of Zola's books were already in the country and being read by many thousands was fully potent in the consciousness of most of the critics in the popular reviews. "To a critic ignorant of the sale of Zola's novels it would seem incredible that it should be necessary to spend time in denouncing them", is the comment of one such reviewer (*Critic*, Dec. 30, 1882, p. 355), and discouraging words like: "We cannot see the use of writing such books or the profit of reading them" (*Lit. Wld.*, Feb. 14, 1880, p. 58 f.) are a refrain that goes through the whole period. Hence Zola's fame is "notoriety" and largely of his own making — which was true, of course — and a further mark of his moral insincerity and dangerousness. Most of the critics knew that Zola claimed a high moral purpose for his work, but it was difficult to reconcile his claim with his practice. "One can hardly call a man who defiles his

readers and besmirches their memory with his obscenities a moralist", is how Perry expressed what must have been the opinion of the great majority of his educated contemporaries. It was a real dilemma, since even Perry acknowledged high qualities of a technical nature in Zola's work, and it is clear that, once the dilemma was solved, the general opinion of Zola would swing round to the exact opposite of its early position.

There was one field in which Zola found fair treatment from the very beginning and that was his critical essays — in those books in which he expounded his theories and attacked existing literary practice. Abstract argumentation could easily be filled out by each reader to his own content and here Zola actually found a great deal of sympathy. "Zola is far more interesting as a critic than as a writer of fiction", the *Nation* said, reviewing *Etudes et Portraits* in 1882. "The book is throughout clever and amusing, full of lively argument and unfailing wit, however strained some of the points may be". (No. 872, Mar. 16.) A few years earlier "Zola as a Critic" had been the subject of an article by Clara Barnes Martin in the *Atlantic* (vol. 43, 1879, pp. 650-656), à propos of *Mes Haines*. She points out the importance of the book as the pronouncement of the new realism and its opposition to the outmoded forms of romanticism and she quotes with a sympathetic objectivity — benevolent neutrality, one might say — those passages she regarded as the "most startling". But the important thing is that the reviewer finds behind the criticism of Zola a personality that arouses a much greater warmth and human interest than ever the novelist did in these early years. It is actually a discovery! These letters, she says, show Zola "not as a cold, unsympathetic outsider, the rude exponent of a protesting reaction. He speaks rather as one who looks back upon the dreams outgrown of childhood". Such cordiality of understanding was a rare thing in those days. "The attitude of the English world at this moment towards Emile Zola may not adequately be described as suspense of judgment", she says quite truly; but, she adds with a marked tolerance: "No one takes up his books without acknowledging their irresistible power". As for his criticism — an aspect of the novelist that was new to American readers — she feels that "no one can help listening to his verdict. Words which from another might seem querulous or jealous, the carping of disappointment, are from him but the frank expressions of conscientious judgment. The triumph of his own success places him beyond the fear of rivals". And in much the same tone Thomas Sergeant Perry, when he reviewed *Le Roman Expérimental* for the *International Review* in 1881, forgot the hot indignation aroused in him by the novels and produced a very able piece of criticism, coolly sceptical as to the scientific pretensions of the author, but with no word of violent condemnation. Perhaps it was not a mere accident, therefore, that the only English translation of *Le Roman Expérimental* appeared in America in 1894.

(To be concluded)

The Road to Standard English

Two more cases in point:

'The Conclusive Perfect' and 'To be for + -ing'

Prof. Zandvoort's article in *E.S.* XXII, 6, on 'pregnant' *one*¹, was a kind of revelation to me. 'Another instance', I told myself, 'of that unbroken chain of Germanic usage, so apparent in many constructions!' I passed in review certain phenomena that had interested me (cp. 'to feed', 'the Verbs with direct and indirect Object', 'to want as an auxiliary, etc.), and thought of such articles as that by the late Prof. van der Gaaf (*E. S.* XIII, 176 ff.) showing up that unbroken continuity in the Germanic word order of modern phrasing. It is true that some of these time-honoured constructions have been preserved chiefly in the dialects, occurring in literature only sporadically, but the dialects seem to be getting their own back now with a vengeance! So there is a very timely use in the study of Old English after all, so long as it is not an end in itself or one to secure a livelihood, but made subservient to the study of the language seen as a whole, which includes the so-called dialects! As a rule however, the dialects are mentioned respectfully but as assiduously fought shy of by the scholarly world, and that is all there is to it. But what opportunities are thus being let slip? I had a friend taking exception (with all due consideration for my feelings) to my article on 'to want' on the grounds that linguistic people ought to put up a danger signal warning readers against them as soon as they dealt with such vulgar constructions, in order to check their spreading. I retorted that I could not see eye to eye with him, since these constructions were very often, as presumably in that case, of very old standing, and not 'thrown up from the deep'. And from this point of view I should welcome them back to Standard English!

With suchlike thoughts in my mind I came to take up the April number of *E. S.* with Prof. Zandvoort's review of Jespersen's *Grammar* (Part V). A few days before I had at long last got hold of the identical volume, and browsing among its pages had just hit upon the chapter dealing with '*you have me beat*' (p. 16). I was duly attracted by it, since I had for years been suspecting this construction to be a case in point, viz. Germanic usage and word-order preserved to the present day. I found Jespersen in agreement with my view, and felt some awe at witnessing such an old construction suddenly re-appearing in the full lime-light of publicity. For such is the fact, and here I beg to differ from Prof. Jespersen and perhaps Prof. Z., too, although the construction has hitherto been hardly thought worthy of notice. I was actually at work on a short article on 'The

¹ Here are some more examples: I'd be *one* fine lover . . . if I never got jealous! (S. Lewis, *Arrowsmith*, Tauchn. p. 79); I'm *one* hell of a good physician; you'll have *one* fine time in a big city like Nautilus. He's *one* awful brainy man (*ib.*, pp. 130, 170, 186); I met up with *one* old homesteader . . . (Hergesheimer, *Cimarron*, p. 15).

Conclusive Perfect', a by-product of another study², and it may be imagined how glad I was of Prof. Zandvoort's review, which, in singling out the very same construction, in a manner paved the way for my own article.

A. The 'Conclusive' Perfect

The Galsworthy example quoted by Jespersen ('you surely *had me scared*') is probably one of the best known of his examples.³ As far back as 1929, when the Tauchnitz school edition of *Two Forsyte Interludes* appeared, I was struck by the inadequacy of the glossarial note: "amer. für engl. 'you certainly *scared me*'"; by an additional cross reference to another passage: '(would) like to have you come' it was suggested that in our case, too, "to have' wird amer. gern eingefügt, wo es überflüssig ist"! Since the chief editor, Prof. Wildhagen, has the express rights reserved to him of overriding any translation or explanation according to his best lights, we may rest assured that the above was either directly inspired by him or at any rate met with his approval. I mention this as a typical example of how our construction was being appraised by the scholarly world about ten years back. In 1931 there appeared Jespersen's *Grammar* (Part IV), in which there was a first tentative mention of '*you've got me beat(en)*' (p. 51). In the same year appeared Curme's *Syntax*. I turned to it hopefully, to find only an exposition of the well-known history of the present perfect: "In the original form of the English construction ('I have the letter written', i.e. in a written state) the past participle was an objective predicate participial adjective and as a predicate had a strong stress ... (which was) transferred to the preceding noun". There is no mention of our construction. Only when dealing briefly with popular Irish usage he adds that "occasionally, in the case of transitive verbs, Irishmen place the object before the perfect participle instead of after it, which gives a peculiar flavour to their language: '*have you your tea taken?*' (L. Robinson)". But in his second volume (*Parts of Speech, Accidence*) appearing in 1935 we find him doing justice to our construction: "*The original form and meaning did not disappear, for we still often desire to use the words with the full force of the present tense:*⁴ '*I have all my letters written*'. '*I have my garden spaded and ready for planting*'. '*Our football team has all the other teams beaten to a frazzle*'" (p. 320/21). This

² 40 *Hauptverba des Englischen und ihre Anwendung*, which I hope to have appearing in print in due course. The above is adopted from this publication by courtesy of the publisher, Herr Rohmkopf of Leipzig.

³ There is, incidentally, another example to be found in the very same text: 'How pretty she looked! A thousand pities to have her apple-cart upset again!' (Tauchn. ed. p. 51; Heinemann ed. p. 54.) — also, in my opinion, erroneously interpreted by the editor as meaning: 'wenn ... alle ihre Pläne wieder durchkreuzt würden.' The meaning is, on the contrary: 'dass er ihr wieder ihre Pläne durchkreuzt *hatte*, hatte durchkreuzen müssen'! Cf. p. 147.

⁴ My italics!

important statement seems to have been totally overlooked by grammarians, tucked away as it is in a volume dealing with accidentence. In the same year that Prof. Curme saw fit to improve upon his former statement there appeared A. G. Kennedy's *Current English*, from which Prof. Zandvoort was quoting: "*the descriptive quality of the participle is often intensified by separating it from the auxiliary, as in 'I have my paper all written'*"⁵. It is obvious, then, that our construction cannot be restricted to verbs meaning 'beat, surpass', etc. (Jespersen, l.c. p. 16), a point already made by Prof. Zandvoort, frequent though these verbs may be in comparison with others. The statements of both Curme and Kennedy were, however, anticipated in a way by Poutsma, who had said as early as 1926: "... the two constructions" (sc. 'he has killed a man' — 'he has a man killed') "sometimes have practically *the same meaning* or are, at least, *difficult to distinguish*. Thus transposition of object and participle *would not materially alter* the meaning of the following quotations: '... a suspicion that the servants *had* a man *secreted* somewhere on the premises' (Dickens); 'he *had* some other party *arranged* for that afternoon' (Thackeray).⁶ Kruisinga has three or four examples of our construction in the fifth edition of his *Handbook*, (1931), §§ 563 and 564.

My point then is that our construction, faithfully preserved in the dialects, has lived on through the centuries, despised by stylists and being used shamefacedly and sporadically only in literature, but appearing even in great writers, whose attention it perhaps slipped through an oversight. But there it was, and such was the force of a living construction, till it re-asserted itself vigorously at the present day.

The Dialects.

a) Irish.

In his article on *Anglo-Irish Syntax* van Hamel had mentioned our construction in 1912 (*Englische Studien*, 45). Originally there was a lack of the verb 'to have' in Celtic (as in Russian), which influenced Anglo-Irish syntax: 'a book is at me'; 'there is hunger on me' (van Hamel). 'She had but one son only, and the name was on him was Hugh Beg O'Lorrha' (Lady Gregory, *The Image*). Thus we find an (originally) aoristic perfect tense formed with the help of the preposition 'after': 'he is after writing' = 'has just written'⁷. Then there is a real 'perfect' tense in Irish: '*I have the letter written*' = '*the action is quite finished*' (van Hamel). I shall give a few more examples of this latter constr. (examples of aoristic perfect tense abound): 'it's lies you told, letting on you *had him slitted*, and you nothing at all' (Synge, *Playboy*, Tauchn. p. 209); 'he *has a drop*

⁵ see *E. S.* XXIII No. 2, p. 48.

⁶ *Part II, Section II*, p. 214/5.

⁷ But also, e.g., expressing the 'continuative perfect': 'how would it be washed up, and we after looking each day for nine days'; 'isn't it nine days herself is after crying', etc. (Synge.)

taken, and it's soon he'll be falling asleep' (Synge, *Shadow of the Glen*); cp.: 'with a drop taken' (Synge, *Playboy*, Tauchn. p. 147); 'she has th' life frightened out o' them' (S. O'Casey, *The Plough and the Stars*, p. 7); *I have you well taped*, me lassie (ib., p. 67). Cp. also the above example from L. Robinson, quoted by Curme: 'have you your tea taken?'. It is unnecessary to look for further examples of this well-established Irish use. One more will suffice: "most of these" (sc. definitions of 'gentleman') "are like the old formula of the Royal Irish Constabulary: 'not drunk, but having drink taken'" (Scarborough, *England Muddles Through*, Tauchn. p. 38).

b) Scottish.

In this connection it may be as well to deal here with 'have got' (see further down). In her booklet on *Use and Abuse of English* (1924) R. Masson adduces the following examples of Scotticisms: 'I have never got him spoken to' ('there is a suggestion of effort implied in the phrase which makes it *much more expressive* than the proper wording; nevertheless it is provincial'). 'Whenever you see Mrs. Brown will you put her in mind that, if *she has got that book read* that she asked the loan of, she can return it?' ('that is a Scotticism, and therefore must not be used, though it is peculiarly expressive').

c) The Midlands.

I got him taped 'is said to have been current in the Midlands long before the Great War' (cf. 'to get' further down).

American Usage.

It will not surprise us to meet with our construction in American texts, since many dialect and ancient phrases were adopted by modern American writers sooner than in Great Britain. So far as can be seen Jespersen gives only four American examples out of a total of eleven. The ratio is reversed with Prof. Zandvoort's examples: seven American ones out of a total of eight. What has been quoted above from both Curme and Kennedy goes to prove that the construction is by now considered 'current'. I may give, however, such additional American examples as I can get hold of at present.

There is first of all a characteristic one from W. Cather's *The Professor's House* (1925): 'By the first of July our money was nearly gone, but we *had our road made*, and *our cabin built* on top of the mesa'. This brings out the 'vollendete Handlung' to good effect. Cf. also: She (sc. the she-bear) tore madly at the great timber (sc. of the 'dead-fall') ..., and so astonishing was the strength of her claws and her vast forearms that in the course of half an hour she *had the trap fairly demolished* (Ch. G. D. Roberts: *The Heart of the Ancient Wood* (1900), Ed. Tauchn. Stud. Series, Neue Folge Nr. 32, p. 34.).

Examples taken from periodicals: I *have it red-lettered* in my notes (*Saturday Rev. of Lit.*, New York, 7.11.1931, p. 259); you *had this all thought out* (ib., 17.9.1932, p. 107); the subject of petting *has all the professors and experts in social hygiene absolutely baffled* (*Readers' Digest*, April 1938, p. 95); as soon as he *had everybody frightened* (ib. June 1938, p. 77); . . who already *have this problem licked* (ib., p. 100); to *have (got) a person skinned* (NED. Suppl., sub 'skin' v. 9e). Cp. also 'to have got'.

Modern British examples.

I came across an example in serious literature which 'had me baffled' at the time: (Lord Beaverbrook) *has the news and the political sense highly developed* and if he frequently annoys he always interests (Sir Robert Donald in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 13th ed., on 'Newspapers' (1922). Here is another example of the literary style: 'the young man *had his head buried* in his hands' (O. Wilde, *The Happy Prince*). Perhaps it is less difficult to hunt up more examples of this kind than might be imagined.*

In the journalistic and spoken language examples are much more numerous. (In the infirmary) there were no frills: that was the point. They *had you wakened* and *washed* remorselessly in the early morning (G. Blake, *Shipbuilders*, Tauchn. p. 257); Blackpool *has them all licked* (Priestley, *English Journey*, Tauchn. p. 273); 'That young fellow, who has just opened that motor repair shop, will succeed. I took my car to him this morning for a job that would take at least two hours anywhere else. He went full pelt at it, and *had it finished* in under an hour!'. (Th. R. G. Lyell, *Slang, Phrase and Idiom*, Tokyo 1931, sub 'pelt', p. 580.) (they) planned a concerted movement . . which began at 8 o'clock and soon *had the Japanese* closely encircled (*Times*, 8.4.1938, p. 16); he *has his troops concentrated* (ib. 10.1.1938, p. 10); in three days we *had our camp pitched* high up on the J. glacier (ib. 8.11.1937, p. 13); a question which *has even the military experts baffled* (Listener, 1938); he *had them routed* and on the run (ib.); to *have someone set* = get the better of, to take at a disadvantage, to get a man convicted (Fraser & Gibbons, *Soldier & Sailor Words and Phrases*, 1925). I may close with two examples which go to prove that the constr. must be considered 'current' in Great Britain, too. Mr. Lloyd George is quite familiar with it, as is seen from his using it repeatedly in his House of Commons speeches: a sort of feeling that he *had them beaten* (*Times*, 23.2.1928, p. 9); they *had their plans made* (ib., 9.5.1939, p. 8).

* Are these examples really on all fours with the others? In undoubted cases like 'He had them routed and on the run', 'You surely had me scared', the subject is represented as doing (or having done) something. In the Beaverbrook example the subject is rather represented as being in possession of something (viz. a keen flair for news etc.). In the Wilde example, *had* is practically equivalent to *held*, and the subject is hardly represented as doing anything. — Ed.

Cases of 'to have got'

Since 'have got' is now extensively used in spoken English for 'have' it is obvious that we should find many examples of our construction. Jespersen is mistaken in believing that it is limited to the United States. Of course we find it in American examples: Captain McMurtry cried: 'We've got them licked, or they wouldn't have sent this!' (*Readers Digest*, Nov. 1938, p. 43; adopted from *The Lost Battalion* by Th. M. Johnson and F. Pratt); I guess you've got us skinned (NED. Suppl., sub 'skin' v. 9e). By the time the sun got up we had already got to the lake and had got our hooks baited (from a made-up paragraph, featuring the excessive use of 'get', *The English Journal*, March, 1937; quoted in *American Speech* VII, 4, 281.) These examples may suffice to illustrate American usage. That the construction is also used in Britain is shown on the one hand by the Scottish examples quoted above. I give a few more British ones: we've got them rattled (*The Listener*, 1938); it's all right; you've got me beat; ye've got the suckers bitched (both from G. Blake, *Shipbuilders*, Tauchn. pp. 229 and 79); I've got him set all right (Lyell, *Slang, Phrase and Idiom*, p. 675). I hope you've got your hair well fastened in (from L. Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*, quoted in *American Speech*, VII, 4, p. 193.)

Since 'got' is also used for 'have got' in modern colloquial speech we also find examples such as: we got them beat this time (R. C. Sherriff, *Badger's Green*). Cp. got you taped under the next item.

To get + Object + Past Participle

The transition from the above construction to one in which 'to get' is used instead of 'to have' (apart from the cases of 'have got' and 'got') seems to me to be found in such examples as the following: he's just a common swindler; it didn't take me long to get him taped. Lyell, from whom this quotation is taken, gives 'to have (get) a person taped = to know all about him, to see through his tricks and pretences and know his real character.' Fraser & Gibbons had already listed the expression (l.c.): "'got you taped': a common expression in the war meaning 'I know what sort of fellow you are, I see through you, I have got you marked' (in allusion to the marking out of ground with tape, an artillery technical term)". The expression is, according to Fraser & Gibbons, said also to have been current in the Midlands long before the war with meaning as stated above (cf. our example taken from S. O. Casey under the item *The Dialects* a).

Now if the above example from Lyell is not due to a mistake on the part of Lyell, (I have so far not met with another British example) we should have to regard this construction as a kind of back-formation from 'have got' and 'got'. I had hesitated to include in this category the American examples, two of which were given by Prof. Zandvoort: 'to get somebody

excited, jittered, etc. This is a recognized American construction, extensively used with *adjectives* and participles in the shape of adjectives, cf. NED. Suppl. and *A Dict. of Am. English* (Part IX), the meaning being 'to succeed in making' (NED Suppl.). But since we also find adjectives used alongside of participles to form the 'Conclusive Perfect', there seems to be a case for including them here.

To have (got) with adjectives, adverbs and prepositional phrases

Such expressions as '*they have got their facts wrong*' = 'they are mistaken' must have contributed largely towards extending the use of the 'Conclusive Perfect', if it is not the other way about. Prof. Zandvoort has several such examples of *to have* with *down, at his mercy, infirm of purpose, on edge*. We must include here his example '*you have my review . . . unpublished*'. Another example is: '*they had me in dread*' (= frightened me: L. Robinson, *The Whiteheaded Boy*, p. 12). Very often the adjectival force of the participle implied in the 'Conclusive Perfect' is very strong indeed ('beaten', 'licked', etc.).

Thus we often find the participles coupled with adjectives, etc.: we *had them routed and on the run* (cf. Mod. Brit. examples); I *have my garden spaded and ready* for planting (Curme). It might be mentioned here that we also find such a sentence as 'the aeroplane had its wheels down' alongside of 'it had its wheels broken'. There is even a construction with double accusative: both would have the village a better and more attractive place (R. Blankenship: *Am. Lit.*, p. 657). So there may be reason enough for including '*to get (have) + Object + (past participle or) adj.*' in this article.

The force and meaning of the 'Conclusive Perfect'

Let me first reiterate the interpretations of the grammarians. According to Curme our construction has 'the full force of the present tense'. (In the case of 'to have got somebody beaten' we should then have assurance doubly sure, since 'have got' is in itself a present perfect with the force of the present). According to Jespersen the meaning is 'hardly different from the perfect, though emphasizing the present state more than the perfect does'. It appears that with the grammarians historical considerations are uppermost in their thoughts, which make them stress the force of the present tense it originally was. Now it is undoubtedly true that the construction has the full force of the present tense; but this does not nearly exhaust the latent possibilities of our construction. Kennedy comes a little nearer to the truth when he writes that 'the descriptive quality of the participle is often intensified by separating it from the auxiliary'. We must bear in mind, too, what R. Masson said: '(this constr.) is

peculiarly expressive; there is a suggestion of effort implied in the phrase which makes it much more expressive than the proper wording'.

And we should not forget the definition given by van Hamel: 'the action is quite finished'. This 'völlig abgeschlossene Handlung' might suitably be expressed by the term 'Conclusive ('vollendetes') Perfect'. There is a definitely adjectival character in the participles used (see above) denoting not so much an act as a state. Besides the construction has a decidedly intensifying force. The 'Conclusive Perfect', as I should like to call it, is, in fact, used to form a statal Passive of Intensity. Whereas with the Passive of Experience ('I had, got, my leg hurt') the interest centres on the subject, the interest in our construction centres on the object of 'have'. 'We've got them beat(en)' is equivalent to 'they have been, are, thoroughly beaten'; 'you've got me beat' = 'I give in'.

It might seem that in some cases (especially if the subject is not a person) the main interest does centre on the subject. 'Blackpool has them all licked' might be an equivalent to 'B. surpasses them all'. But on looking closer one sees that the object is, after all, the main concern of the author's. Priestley compares B. to Brighton and Margate, which are 'merely playing at being popular seaside resorts' in comparison with B., which 'has them all licked'. So if at the end of our article we return to the old example taken from Dickens (see above): 'the servants had a man secreted on the premises' we realize that both Poutsma and Jespersen failed to grasp the full import of the words (which even a round dozen of examples may not be enough to elucidate), believing as they did that the meaning was 'hardly different from the perfect'. There is a great difference between the two constructions, i.e. the 'Conclusive Perfect' and the present perfect ('the servants had secreted a man on the p.'). The two constructions are neither 'difficult to distinguish', nor can it be said that 'transposition of object and participle would not materially alter the meaning'. It would indeed! The present perfect does not convey a fraction of the force implied in the Conclusive Perfect, with which the interest centres on 'a man'. And surely Dickens wanted to convey to us the idea that 'a man' was an object of horror and anxiety for Miss Murdstone! Small wonder, then, that we find Dickens slipping back almost involuntarily into the time-honoured popular construction, which has now at long last made its way into recognized usage. For I think it is definitely 'on the road to Standard English'.

B. To be for + -ing: an Auxiliary of Volition

The latest English-German dictionary compiled by Prof. Wildhagen (Tauchnitz, 1938), which is in many respects a great improvement on previous works of the kind because it lists a great many current expressions, has the following entry sub 'to be': "to be for = sich entscheiden, erklären für. I am for walking". This seems an unusually stilted way of putting

it, and a crude attempt at translating a current idiomatic construction. It goes to prove, however, that the above construction is not yet recognized in its true force of meaning.

I had been collecting examples of this particular usage for some time when I accidentally came across a passage in Aronstein's *Englische Stilistik* (1924) dealing with the matter briefly. I am bound to dig it up anew, because it in a way anticipates the results of my own observations. In the course of a discussion on the various ways of rendering the German 'wollen' (obviously on the pattern of Krüger; he quotes the latter's *Syntax* § 2952; he might also have consulted his *Unenglisches Englisch*, sub 'wollen') he introduces our construction (p. 79). Here is what he says: "Diesen können wir noch eine sehr häufige Bildung hinzufügen, die 'wollen' im Sinne von 'entschlossen sein', 'die Absicht haben', 'der Meinung sein', 'dafür stimmen' bedeutet. Es ist die Bildung *to be for*. Sie ist synonym, aber doch nicht gleichbedeutend mit 'to mean to' und 'to intend to'. Ich muss hier eine ganze Reihe von Beispielen anführen, da diese Bildung der grammatischen Theorie noch unbekannt zu sein scheint". In a footnote he adds: "Das NED. erwähnt zwar die Bedeutung 'to be for' = 'to be anxious for', 'to desire', 'to want' und fügt die Bemerkung hinzu 'dial'. Die Bedeutung ist aber mehr 'to mean', 'to intend to', und die Ausdrucksweise ist sicherlich nicht dialektisch, sondern ist in die Gemeinsprache übergegangen".

Unquestionably Aronstein was right in his contention that the construction is a current equivalent of an auxiliary of volition and that this has hitherto been overlooked by grammarians; but his plea for its recognition has so far met with no response. The reason for this may partly be found in the fact that far from giving 'eine ganze Reihe von Beispielen' he actually adduces but two modern ones, taken from a translation of Frenssen's *Jörn Uhl*. The second of these examples has, for the matter of that, a curiously old-fashioned ring about it⁸, so that practically only one example of current English remains. For the rest his examples are taken from Goldsmith (three), G. Eliot (one), and Meredith (one). Another reason for not accepting Aronstein's thesis might be found in the fact that all these latter examples from the classical writers could be interpreted as examples of the NED. definition given sub 23c: '...to be in favour of, advocate'. As a matter of fact Prof. Wildhagen's above mentioned signification is obviously a translation of this NED. definition, which is to be considered Standard English, whereas that given sub 23d ('to be anxious for, to desire, to want'), for which, by the way, no examples are adduced, is termed 'dial.'. Thus we see that Aronstein's evidence was indeed far from conclusive.

⁸ 'He would fling the robes round him, and in this guise *would be for* going down into the big room' (= riss die Kleider an sich und *wollte* damit in den Saal hinuntergehen). This may be compared to the example adduced by A. from Goldsmith (*She Stoops to Conquer*, V): *you would be for* running away by night, without knowing one inch of the way = du wolltest nun einmal bei Nacht fortlaufen.

And yet Aronstein was right, and I think even the examples from the classical writers he adduces do belong in this category, as does one from Macaulay, which the NED., in my opinion wrongly, places sub 23c: 'he was for going straight into the harbour of Brest'. That we should meet with several examples of our construction in literature (six in all, then) at a time when it was considered 'dialect' by grammatical theory should not surprise us, especially when we keep in mind what has been said above on the subject of the 'Conclusive Perfect'. It is just another example of how 'dialectal' expressions and constructions will sporadically insinuate themselves into the works of even great writers, such is the force of the spoken language! Incidentally I can add a seventh example from Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*: 'Joseph was for retreating, as we have seen, when his father's jokes ... caused him to pause and stay where he was' (Ch. III).

That the construction was considered pure dialect in his day is proved by J. Wright, who duly mentions our constr. sub 'for' 3 and says it is 'used with the verb 'to be', in the sense of 'to desire, incline to, intend, purpose'. He gives several dialect examples. Part III of the NED. (with 'to be') appeared in 1887, Vol. II of Wright's *Dial. Dict.* in 1900. At the turn of the century, then, it was to be termed 'dial.'. It was still used as a dialect construction e.g. by H. Caine in *The Manxman* (1894): 'I was for telling you of a job (Tauchn. Vol. I, p. 153 and in other places), and still in 1906 by W. de Morgan (*J. Vance*): 'he'll be for crockin' it' (Tauchn. Vol. I, p. 15 and in other places). It is, of course, still living today in the dialects, cp: 'you were for making a fortune out of tobacco' (L. Robinson, *The Whiteheaded Boy*, 1920. Irish).

With the turn of the century, however, it seems to have been used to an ever increasing degree by modern writers⁹, so that at present it must be considered a current construction, to which nobody would take exception, and which has definitely lost the dialectal flavour it had before, although the NED. Supplement has not included it among its addenda.

Here are some examples which are characteristic of British and American usage, all of them devoid of any such meaning as 'sich entscheiden, erklären für, etc.' but just showing the force of an auxiliary of volition: Mr. L. is for taking no risks (*Manchester Guardian Daily*, 18.5.1926, p. 8, 4); I'm for giving him ... (ib. 20.5.1924, p. 16); they were for leaving (R. Macaulay, *Orphan Island*; Tauchn. p. 22); she was for giving him up (ib.); Mr. Britling was for flying off again (Wells); Fay was for standing a little way off (Wells, *Christina Alberta*, Tauchn. p. 149); Fleur was for going straight on (Galsworthy, *Forsyte S.*); I am all for maintaining the purity of the English language (*Times*). One is for giving him up (Cunliffe, *Modern English Playwrights*, New York 1927, p. 110;

⁹ Frenssen's *J. Uhl* was published in 1901; it may be supposed that this immensely popular book was soon after translated into English.

they are for resolving religion into ... *Saturday Rev. of Lit.*, New York, p. 778/1927.

Although this is not a very formidable array of examples they represent a fair sample of current usage. It is safe to say that with it another construction has re-asserted itself in our time, and has successfully entered upon the road to Standard English. If many more are not well under way 'I miss my guess'.

Jena.

G. KIRCHNER.

Reviews

Angelsachsen und Kelten im Urteil der Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum des Beda. Von H. BLASCHE. 55 pp. Göttingen: Gerstung & Lehmann. 1940. RM. 2.—.

From Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* the writer has collected the passages illustrative of the contact between the Anglo-Saxons on one hand and the Britons and Irish on the other. The inferences drawn are not particularly surprising. As to the Irish there is a profound appreciation of the saintly character of their missionaries, but the principles of the Celtic Church are rejected in full consciousness of the superiority of the current that reached England from Rome. With regard to the Britons the attitude is frankly hostile, which is but natural, since it is almost exclusively based upon Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae*. These facts were not unknown. That this has not been sufficiently realized by Dr. Blasche is a consequence of the rather narrow limits to which his reading has been restricted. Works of primary importance for the study of early Celtic Christianity and its influence on the neighbouring countries, such as those by Gougaud (*Les Chrétientés Celtiques*), Chevalier (*Essai sur la Formation de la Nationalité et les Réveils religieux au Pays de Galles*) and Slover (*Early literary Channels between Britain and Ireland*), are not even mentioned. By a more comprehensive study of the subject the scope might have been widened and the understanding deepened; as the book is now it adds but little to our knowledge. Its principal merit is that the method followed is a strict and both historically and philologically sound one that does not depart from the facts; the danger of getting lost in a jungle of speculations has been carefully avoided.

Dr. Blasche intends his work as a contribution to the study of early Anglo-Celtic relations in general. Of these he speaks in an introductory chapter and, it must be admitted, it is here that the fragmentary character of the materials used makes itself felt in a rather embarrassing manner. What is the good of quoting Sarrazin's comparison of Cædmon's Hymn

with the opening lines of Niníne's Irish Prayer to St. Patrick, if the two have not one single word in common? Or of Sieper's theory that the reference made to the cuckoo in the Old English *Seafarer* points to Celtic influence? As a matter of fact, although the cuckoo takes a prominent place in Celtic nature poetry, there are earlier allusions to it of purely English origin as, for instance, in one of Alcuin's letters. That there was a certain amount of intermarrying between Angles and Britons is now generally accepted, even for Bede's time; this can never be rendered more probable by the existence of northern English pedigrees in the eleventh century, where English and Celtic proper names occur side by side. What, however, must be deplored more than anything is that the writer evidently has no first-hand knowledge in the Celtic field. In this respect his silence on the Irish historical material is significant. But, in fact, sometimes silence is better than words. Speaking of king Aldfrid of Northumbria, whom the Irish called Flann Fina, Dr. Blasche quotes the translation of an Irish poem, which is in the manuscripts ascribed to this Anglian king. This translation is far from satisfactory, the text on which it is based is defective. In the Irish periodical *Eriu*, vol. VIII, a complete and critical text might have been found, together with a translation as reliable as the present-day state of Irish studies admits. But what imports even more is that the poem cannot possibly be by Aldfrid himself, since on both linguistic and prosodic grounds it is clearly proved to be of a later, even a much later time. This Dr. Blasche might have learned from a look in Thurneysen's *Zu irischen Texten und Literaturdenkmälern*, I p. 21, where in connexion with this poem Aldfrid is named as 'der angebliche Dichter'. It was a serious mistake to draw a supposed illustration of Irish eighth century christianity from a spurious text like this. As a reflexion of the early English view of Irish affairs the poem is worthless.

Utrecht.

A. G. VAN HAMEL.

Konjunktionen und Modus im Temporalsatz des Altenglischen.
 Von HANS MÖLLMER. (Sprache und Kultur der Germanischen
 und Romanischen Völker. A. Anglistische Reihe. Band XXIV).
 xii + 118 pp. Breslau: Priebatsch. 1937. RM. 6.—.

The scope of this work is partly the same as that of Adams' book *The Syntax of the Temporal Clause in Old English Prose* (Yale Studies in English 32, New York 1907), but apart from the fact that Dr. Möllmer includes Old English poetry in his investigation of the conjunctions and the mood of time-clauses in Old English, his method too differs from that of Adams. Dr. Möllmer lays the stress on the rise of the conjunctions and starts from the development of the hypotactical sentence-form from the paratactical construction and, parallel to this, the rise of the conjunctions

from originally paratactical adverbs. His method is the same as that of Prof. W. Horn in his excellent article on the conjunction *though* (W. Horn, *Untersuchungen zur historischen englischen Syntax. Archiv* 154, 1928, pp. 213-223). Moreover, Dr. Möllmer compares, as far as possible, the Old English translations with their Latin originals in order to find out if and in how far Latin influence must be assumed on the formation of the conjunctions.

In an introductory chapter, in which a lucid description is given of the development of parataxis, the author shows how hypotactical clauses could arise in two ways, a) the second of two paratactical sentences could become hypotactical to the first, or b) of three paratactical sentences the second could become hypotactical to the third. This transition was effected when the speaker became conscious of the logical connection between the two sentences. Now the conjunctions, which in the paratactical sentence-structure were adverbs, could be placed either at the end of the first sentence or at the beginning of the second and combinations of two adverbs into one conjunction thus became possible when the transition from parataxis to hypotaxis was made in the mind of the speaker. In this way the simple conjunctions arose, and also the compound conjunctions, such as *æ̅r þon, þonne þonne* etc., also *þā þā*, as the author very aptly illustrates (p. 16). A strong argument in favour of this theory is the rise of the conjunction *forþ þæt*, whose development can be followed within the Old English period before our very eyes (p. 97).

A difference between prose and poetry is that in poetry many cases of asyndetic parataxis occur instead of the hypotaxis that might be expected from the logical meaning of the sentences. According to Möllmer (p. 4) this is due to the archaic character of poetry, but it seems to me that this is perhaps more a matter of style: in this way a certain vividness was attained in the recitation.

After this introduction the conjunctions are discussed separately. In the course of the treatment it is pointed out that, when the Latin translations began to be made, new formations came into existence, such as *þonne þonne, þā þā*, etc. (see the list on p. 115). This became necessary because Latin had a fully developed hypotactical sentence-structure and prepositional and participial constructions had to be rendered into Old English which did not possess these constructions. Yet the direct Latin influence on the formation of conjunctions is not so great as might perhaps be expected: it is rightly assumed by the author in only a few cases, such as *mid þȳ þe* (Lat. *cum*), *betwux þām þe* (Lat. *inter*). Less certain seems to me *æfter þā̅m þe* (according to Möllmer under the influence of Lat. *postquam*): the statistics given on p. 69 do not seem very convincing.

The author has some interesting remarks, too, on the fact that the development of the conjunctions illustrates the existence of two opposite tendencies that run parallel in the language. On the one hand there is the tendency to shorten the conjunctions by knocking off everything superfluous: *þā while þe* > *þā hwile* > *hwile*. Again we find *oþ þæt*,

but also *op þe*, and *op* simply; *ongemang þām þe* becomes *amang þæt*. On the other hand, however, there is the tendency to extend the conjunctions. For this purpose the particle *þe* is often used, by the side of which *þæt* is also found. The function of *þe* (*þæt*) is then to mark outwardly the hypotactical character of the clause. Thus we find *þā þe*, *þonne þe*, *ær þon þe*, *op þæt þe* (cp. above *op þæt* > *op*), further *þā hwile þe* (*þæt*). This *þæt* is even added to conjunctions in which it has no organic justification: *swā þæt*, *sipþan þæt* (see pp. 45, 72, 41, 67).

As regards the last part of the book, dealing with the mood of the time-clauses, it is shown that clauses of time with the conjunction *ær* mostly have the subjunctive (pp. 99 ff). Originally in these clauses the subjunctive was used after a positive headclause and the indicative after a negative headclause. Naturally, in the Old English period many deviations from this "rule" occur and when a subj. appears where an indicative was to be expected (e.g. after a negative headclause), it has in most cases lost its own stylistic value (p. 103).

In time-clauses introduced by other conjunctions the indicative prevails. In those cases in which the subj. does occur the clause often has a hypothetical character or a wish is often implied on the part of the speaker.

A few minor points may be added:

P. 10f. It seems more in accordance with the state of the language in *Beowulf* to consider B. 2428, 2567 hypotactically as clauses introduced by the conjunction *þā*, as Klaeber does. On the other hand, in the example B. 1741 (p. 21) Klaeber's interpunction shows that he takes *þonne* here to be an adverb. In all these cases Möllmer admits the possibility of a choice.

P. 19. *þā* in a concessive meaning occurs in two instances: John XII, 37 and XXI, 11, but in both cases it may be due to Latin *cum*, which is usually translated by *þā*.

P. 34. *þær* shading off into *when*; the ex. from B. 1279 is not right: *þær* has here a local meaning. The explanation of B. 2698 is rather forced: the hand of the brave man burned in that place where ("an dem Ort, wo") he helped

P. 38. The question of *swā* and its relation to *sōna swā* was discussed in 1932 by Hoops in his *Beowulfstudien* pp. 15 f. Hoops's arguments are the same as Möllmer's, so that the latter should have referred to Hoops.

P. 53. Although on the whole I agree with the author as regards the rise of the conjunctions, I think that in the case of *þenden* it is not necessary to assume that originally it was the last word of the first paratactical sentence. The examples from *Andreas* (1397, 1713) seem to me to point to the fact that *þenden* was originally an adverb introducing the second sentence, for according to the original paratactical meaning of the word, "during this time", *þenden* seems to me to belong in sense logically to the second sentence.

P. 89. It might have been pointed out that the vague meaning of *op þæt* to indicate "progress of narrative" (Klaeber, *Glossary*) is still present

in modern English *until* and in Dutch *totdat*. This also holds good for the consecutive meaning of *op þæt* (p. 91). In both cases the translation may remain *until*.

Dr. Möllmer's book is a sound treatise done with care and acumen. It is to be hoped that the author will have the opportunity of continuing his researches in the direction indicated on p. 118 and find out which conjunctions were lost in the course of the Old English period, what was the reason of this loss and how they were replaced.

Wageningen.

B. J. TIMMER.

Martin Tupper and the Victorian Middle Class Mind. By RALF BUCHMANN. (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 10. Band.) 165 pp. Bern: Francke. 1941. Price Sw. Fr. 9.50.

To the best of my knowledge this is the only book ever written about Tupper (apart from his autobiography), a curious fact in view of his once enormous popularity and the representative character of his work. From the point of view of literary history, Tupper has moreover the distinction of being very nearly the only writer to influence Walt Whitman (a fact not mentioned by Mr. Buchmann, and perhaps not very generally known), unlike as the two writers were in every other respect than the externals of style, and widely apart as was their poetical merit.

No doubt a very interesting, or a very amusing book could be written about Tupper. He might be treated objectively, to throw a light on the tastes and opinions of the public which bought his books so eagerly, or he might be made the object of an ironic treatment like that which Lytton Strachey used to accord to his victims. Mr. Buchmann does neither. His book consists of a restatement of the familiar, rather superficial generalizations about the Victorian middle class, which contains nothing that has not been said before, but with even more and cheaper sarcasm than it was customary to display twenty years ago, when this sort of thing had not yet become vieux jeu, together with a series of quotations from Tupper chosen to show how he fits into the picture.

The writer is so eager to demonstrate the superiority of his own taste and intelligence to those of the Victorians, and more especially Tupper, that he can scarcely bring himself to mention the latter without some derogatory epithet: "bathos", "bombast", "philistine", "this mediocre, naive poet", "puerilities", "hazy, illogical meanderings", "insipid sentimentality", etc., etc. He cannot even quote poor Tupper without interlarding his quotations with exclamation marks, sometimes two of them at a time. Nothing about Tupper appears to be even tolerable, and we are e.g. invited to regard it as somehow compromising that he had eight children, that his wife had a still-born baby, and that he had a "worthy" (i.e. venerable?)

beard. One cannot help wondering a little at the feeling of superiority which must underlie this attitude to the Victorians. One can at a pinch understand that writers in the early 1920's should have regarded their own age as in every way better, wiser, and more truly enlightened, humane, sensible and moral than that of their grandfathers, but who would maintain that of 1940 and 1941?

The book is written in an English which is, on the whole, very fluent and colloquial, though with some rather surprising lapses. It is carelessly produced. One of the characters in *Vanity Fair* is mentioned as "Major Jobbin", and Macaulay is credited with an essay on "The Grammatists of the Restoration". It is heavily overwritten, and contains enough exclamation marks and rhetorical questions for ten ordinary books. It is discursive and abounds with digressions and irrelevant comparisons (as when Tupper is compared with Henry James and Edith Sitwell). A few samples will perhaps best convey its quality (the exclamation marks are Mr. Buchmann's):

A couplet from Wordsworth is described as "at any rate not equipped with a rudder, to evade the troubled slimy waters of error, where even an eel can be mistaken for a snake!" "I am convinced that the moralizing didactic tendency, which H. Taine principally ascribed to English poetry, is not purely an invention". "It is astonishing that his (Tennyson's) poetry, of which a great part was undoubtedly first class, should be so fashionable". "Still, his (Tupper's) is not poetry that appeals to the ear, and I believe this to be the most important criterion of poetry, and so his verse does not deserve any further discussion as to its artistic merits". "Frequently an extremely virtuous and moral mind is coupled with a warm heart and a soul of simple innocence". "As a true Victorian and Englishman he had a sense of duty. And since Nelson's famous utterance, the sense of duty has been the Englishman's pride, but also the cause of much derisive laughter". "Reason applied to religion is always dangerous to the latter"! "The darling child is there (in the Victorian home) to be kissed and fondled, treatment which a psycho-analyst would interpret in a manner not exactly to Tupper's liking."

Copenhagen.

C. A. BODELSEN.

Brief Mention

Orbis Artium en Renaissance. I. Cornelius Valerius en Sebastianus Foxius Morzillus als Bronnen van Coørnhert. Door G. KUIPER. xx + 381 pp. Harderwijk: Drukkerij Flevo. 1941. (Diss. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.)

This doctoral thesis contains a conscientious and illuminating study of the manuals of dialectics, grammar, physics, ethics, rhetoric, etc., written by the sixteenth-century Louvain professor of Latin, Cornelius Valerius (born at Utrecht, 1512), and his Spanish

pupil, Foxius Morzillus, and of their influence on contemporary authors. Dr. Kuiper shows by parallel quotation the dependence of Coornhert's *Wellevenskunste* on the treatises on ethics of the two humanists, and — what explains our mentioning his thesis here — that of Thomas Wilson's *Rule of Reason* (1551) on Valerius' *Tabulae Dialectices*. Apart from this, however, his work deserves the attention of all students of sixteenth-century literature, for the methods and ideas described in it are those on which many of the principal writers of the period had been brought up. We look forward with much interest to Volume II, which is to contain the results of further investigations into the influence exercised by Valerius' humanistic 'encyclopaedia'. — Z.

Des Darmstädter Schriftstellers Johann Heinrich Künzel (1810-1873) Beziehungen zu England. Mit ungedruckten (oder wenigstens wenig bekannten) Briefen von Carlyle, Dickens, Macaulay, Chr. von Bunsen, F. Freiligrath u.a. Von WALTHER FISCHER. (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 67.) 80 pp. Giessen: von Münchowsche Universitäts-Druckerei Otto Kindt GmbH. 1939. RM. 4.—.

Künzel is an interesting figure in the history of English-German cultural relations in the middle of the nineteenth century. He wrote, among other things, a biography of Sir Robert Peel, managed a series of performances of German plays in London in 1852, and with his friend Freiligrath planned a weekly, *Britannia*, which was to have contained translations of English poetry and articles on English literature and cultural life generally, but which was still-born in 1841. Professor Fischer has collected the available evidence on Künzel's life and work, including some very characteristic letters addressed to him by Carlyle, Dickens and Macaulay. We find Dickens, in 1838, enormously pleased with himself and his dazzling success as an author; Macaulay in 1851 patronizingly announcing: "I shall read with much interest the remarks of an enlightened foreigner on the character and conduct of my illustrious countryman"; and Carlyle, in sterling phrase, observing: "He that honestly interprets between his own country and another, that makes his own country understand another, is doing, in all manner of senses, a good service." Professor Fischer is to be congratulated on the publication of this little volume, which sheds many valuable sidelights on a period full of interest in both countries concerned. — Z.

With Malice Toward Some. By MARGARET HALSEY. (Tauchnitz Edition of British and American Authors, Volume 5362.) 255 pp. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1939. Paper Boards, RM. 2.—.

To those interested in the reactions of an American woman, the wife of an exchange professor at Exeter, to the English character and English ways of life, these impressions and reflections in diary form may be recommended. The author is gifted with a faculty of keen observation and a vivid, sometimes rather caustic style, and she does not invariably prefer everything American to everything English. Yet the book reveals the essential incompatibility of the two national temperaments. "This is the third time I have come into England, and I seem always to have the same reaction — an excited discovery, or re-discovery, of the country-side; a profound gratitude for everybody's peacefulness and good manners; and a feeling (arising from the amateurishness of the food, heating, lighting, stores and women's clothes) that I am just playing house with the kiddies and that in a quarter of an hour I will have to get back to the serious business of life again." — Z.

The Tauchnitz Book of Famous Essays. Compiled and with an Introduction, by PAUL HEMPEL. (Tauchnitz Edition of British and American Authors, Volume 5367.) 411 pp. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1940. Paper Boards, RM. 2.—.

This volume contains a selection of 69 essays, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. They are arranged according to subject-matter: Of Fancies, Reveries and Whimsicalities; Town and Country; Nature; Travel; Of Persons and Characters; Wisdom. The authors' list consists of 27 names, including three Americans (Emerson, Irving, and Thoreau). Matthew Arnold is the latest author represented. The editor has contributed a brief introduction in rather curious English. Within its limits a very useful volume. — Z.

Bibliography

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA

Sir Thomas Elyot, The Defence of Good Women. Edited by E. J. HOWARD. xvi + 85 pp. Oxford, Ohio: Anchor Press. 1940. \$1.25.

Nicholas Udall's Roister Doister. Edited by G. SCHEURWEGHS. (Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, Vol. XVI.) lxxxiv + 132 pp. Louvain: Ch. Uyst-pruyst. 1939.

The Passionate Pilgrim by William Shakespeare. Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, with an Introduction by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. lxvi pp. + sigs. A1—D8. New York and London: For the Trustees of Amherst College, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1939. \$4.00.

William Shakespeare, The Passionate Pilgrim. The Third Edition, 1612, reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, with an introduction by HYDER E. ROLLINS. New York: Scribners'. 1940. xlii + 136 pp.

Henry the Fourth, Part Two. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. A New Variorum Edition, edited by M. A. SHAABER. xx + 715 pp. Philadelphia: Lippincott. 1940. \$7.50.

Ignatius his Conclave, or his inthronisation in a late election in hell. By JOHN DONNE. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1611, with an introduction by C. M. COFFIN. (Facsimile Text Society, 53.) xxxii + 148 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. \$1.60.

William Wordsworth: Poetical Works. Poems written in youth, poems referring to the period of childhood. Edited from the mss., with textual and critical notes by E. DE SELINCOURT. xvi + 379 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Oxford University Press. 1940. \$6.00.

Robert Browning: Poetical Works. Complete from 1833 to 1868 and the shorter Poems thereafter. (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors.) xiv + 698 pp. London: Humphrey Milford. New York: Oxford University Press. [1941]. \$1.75.

Zola and the American Public

(Concluded)

Looking back upon the popular American reaction to the impact of Zola in the eighties of the last century we can say — now without fear of being called reactionary! — that it was healthy and not very far wrong. There was no doubt whatever that the renderings of Mary Sherwood were being read by the ton from motives that had nothing whatever to do with art. To expect the average American reader and critic of that day to distinguish between the artistry and the ethics of a novel is not doing him or the problem justice. Zola was speaking a language that most people in his own country did not understand, and though it seems an ancient one in the light of what can be published today, at that time his public had to be educated "up" to it in America as well as anywhere else. On the whole, what strikes one in the American attitude is its comparative balance and discrimination. Resistance in England, coming later, was more violent and actually led to a legal scandal. In America things took a smoother and more equable course, perhaps because the leading men of letters, early recognizing Zola's true qualities and aims, were more diplomatic in their public utterances and silences.

Mr. Edwards has pointed out that both Henry James and William Dean Howells entertained an opinion of their great French colleague that was at variance with the popular condemnation. As early as 1876 James met Zola at Flaubert's house in Paris, though his report of the meeting in a letter to Howells does not show any deep impression made on him by Zola in particular. But in 1884 the case is altered and James is as enthusiastic as his nature would allow. In a letter to Howells dated February 21, he confesses that "there is nothing more interesting to me now than the effort and experiment of this little group, with its truly infernal intelligence of art, form, manner — its intense artistic life. They do the only kind of work today that I respect; and in spite of their ferocious pessimism and their handling of unclean things, they are at least serious and honest." That was the craftsman's approach, the differentiation between art and morality, or rather the identification of art and morality, that the average American reader had yet to learn to understand. In the pages of the *Atlantic* both James and Howells placed their views before the public that same year. Speaking of the Flaubert group James said: "The conviction that held them together was the conviction that art and morality are two perfectly different things, and that the former has no more to do with the latter than it has with astronomy or embryology". (Quoted by Edwards p. 118.) And Howells followed a little later in the year with an account of a meeting of the naturalistic school at Daudet's house in Paris, describing their interest in the *mot juste*. "It is the pursuit

of this high, mysterious beauty", he says rapturously, "the search for this soul of words that appears on contact with other words, and bursts forth and illumines the pages with an unanalyzable, subtle light, that forms the constant care and study of the modern French novelists". (Quoted by Edwards.)

All that, of course, was caviary — the shop-talk typical of the generation, and hardly what the public needed, which was vitally interested in what Zola had to say and very little in the degree or the quality of the art with which he said it. Along this line a change in the general appreciation of Zola could hardly have been brought about. But there were other men besides these two master-craftsmen who had an adequate conception of Zola and who were in a better position to mediate between him and the American public. Besides, they were both earlier in the field than the novelists and in much less "high-brow" journals.

The first was Mayo Williamson Hazeltine, an unsuccessful New York lawyer who had turned to literary journalism in his thirty-seventh year and become literary editor of the *New York Sun* under Dana in 1878. Hazeltine was a Harvard graduate, had studied at Oxford and travelled extensively in Europe, and knew the Paris described by Zola at first hand. His reviews and literary articles in the Sunday edition of the *Sun* attracted considerable attention and a number of them were collected in 1883 in a volume entitled *Chats about Books, Poets and Novelists*. Among them perhaps the most remarkable is an appreciative article on Zola that was probably one of the first, appearing in 1878, when *Une Page d'Amour* was still the only novel translated into English⁷. Hazeltine places the discussion of Zola on a base of such width and depth that no other American critic of his generation can compete with him. It is the approach neither of the narrow-minded moralist nor of the cool craftsman, but rather that of the historian and sociologist. He carefully avoids distributing marks and medals, but shows such a wide knowledge of the literary history of his time and such a sense of the dynamics of his age, that one immediately feels his sure mastership. His introductory paragraph stakes out the wide limits of his purview:

"Whether our tastes or our convictions prompt us to side with those who praise, or with those who scout him, the fact is beyond dispute that Emile Zola has attained a measure of success seldom paralleled in our generation, and that his themes and his style, his aims, methods, and performances have provoked the widest attention and the liveliest discussion throughout Europe. The truth is that the author of the series of novels, grouped together under the generic title of "Les Rougon-Macquart" is a phenomenon that invites at once the study of the artist, the scientist, and the politician. As regards subject and treatment, Emile Zola incarnates an æsthetic revolution, while in his social and political leanings

⁷ The article has been substantially reprinted in Stedman and Hutchinson's *Library of American Literature*, vol. 10, pp. 90-95. I have used this reprint.

he represents the literary side of the great upheaval which followed the collapse of the second empire. Still more curious and suggestive is his deliberate application of Darwinism to literature, his portrayal of life and character under the strict conditions of the evolutionary theory, namely, heredity and atavism on the one hand, with environment and natural or sexual selection on the other. These are Zola's credentials, and such a man deserves to be scanned, if not with sympathy and approval, at all events with respect, as the type of an epoch."

In developing these points in the body of his article Hazeltine passes French realistic fiction in rapid and light-handed review from Rousseau to Flaubert, the latter's mantle falling in the end on the shoulders of Zola. The fundamental physiological theory of the Rougon-Macquart series is explained and its application in the various novels illustrated, Hazeltine remarking, however, that before natural scenery Zola's scientific rigor seems to desert him, "as if the God whom he had lost in the labyrinth of physiology were found again in the play of light and motion, the infinite beauty and suggestion of the inanimate world". He recognizes the lack of depth in Zola's people, the merely surface psychology of their conception, but he argues that that is the extent to which we all know one another and a deeper artistic psychology is essentially a matter of style. "Now, is it the business of a novelist to draw figures of which we shall say, these are men and women, ordinary, every-day folk, neither better nor worse; or figures in which you shall recognize winning and noble types sufficiently individualized for you to caress the dream of their possible incarnation? That is the question at issue between the realist and the idealist, and Zola, for his part, does not hesitate to accept the former conception of the function undertaken by the writer of prose fiction". His language, says Hazeltine, is adapted to his subject; the shocking argot of the Faubourg St. Antoine is not met with in the salons of the Tuileries. His novels are written on set themes selected from the life of France that Zola knew, and Hazeltine stresses the value of his portrayal as material for the future historian — a conception that later became typical of the whole school. As to the merits of Zola's contention that truth is in itself art, Hazeltine passes no judgment, though his position is clear. "It is one thing", he remarks, "to watch, rapt and awe-struck, on the stage of an Athenian theatre those who have sinned in the high places, a Thyestes, a Clytemnestra, caught in the meshes of an irrevocable doom. It is another thing to track the fetid course of a lewd woman from pinchbeck magnificence to hopeless squalor, from the lazaretto to the morgue". But his obvious preference for the conservative conception does not lead him to a cheap condemnation of the French novelist; he contents himself with marking the difference in position between the two types of art and leaves the final judgment and preference to the reader. It is criticism on a high plane, and as such, in the whole controversy about Zola, it stands alone.

For Brander Matthews, in his article on Present Tendencies in the French Drama, in *Lippincott's Magazine* for April 1881, only touched the main

questions obliquely. Matthews, then a young instructor at Columbia and married to a prominent actress, had, like Hazeltine, enjoyed the advantages of a cosmopolitan education and took a broad view of the problems created by Zola. His main interest was the contemporary theatre and its development in the near future. "The coming power is naturalism", he says, "and Emile Zola is its prophet". But his faith in Zola's abilities as a dramatist is not very strong, in spite of the fact that "Thérèse Raquin" is a grim and ghastly drama, full of main strength and directness, and having the simplicity of genius". Matthews expects more than that. "For ten years Zola has been crying aloud from the house-top that reform is necessary in the drama, but he has not yet proved his case by showing an example". And Matthews winds up with the declaration of his disbelief in the principles Zola stands for. "We may be sure that morality will find full expression ... in spite of Zola's precept and practice".

The novels are treated with the same easy-going, slightly Bohemian optimism that was characteristically Matthews all through. "In this country", he says, Zola "has rather an unsavoury reputation from the dirt which encumbers the corners of his ignoble but powerful novels." This dirt, he adds, "hides their strength and keeps many from reading them." And then he makes a fine distinction that flashes a revealing light on the heart of the problem of the novels. "Although indecent", he says, "they are not immoral, any more than a clinic or a dissection is immoral, and it is as the operator of a clinic that M. Zola poses". His lack of taste, Matthews says, deprives his strength of the guide it needs, and his gloomy outlook upon life is such that "Schopenhauer himself could scarcely be more pessimistic". It is in this connection that Matthews misses the saving grace of humor that Rabelais, for instance, had. "Like most reformers," — Matthews obviously has little sympathy for the breed! — "M. Zola breaks too many images, his zeal runs away with him". But his execution is better than his theory, says Matthews — against the verdict of most of his critical contemporaries. "When we examine his novels we find his practice better than his precepts; he is often an artist in spite of himself".

Matthews was clearly *au dessus de la mêlée*; but the broad intelligence of his judgments, the fine perception of artistic and ethical values evinced in them, were not enough to turn the tide of Zola criticism in the United States. Matthews was taking things too easily, was apparently too little in earnest and, figuratively speaking, never lost the cigarette from his lips. In a way, he was too French adequately to deal with the American Zola-problem. For that it needed a stronger, more resounding personality, a man of deep earnestness and large aims, above all a man that met Zola and his critics on their own level of public and private morality. That man came in due time, but he was neither American nor French but a naturalized Scotchman speaking at Concord in the last gleams of the setting sun of classical New England.

Out of Amos Bronson Alcott's annual philosophical lecture tours in the Middle West, which spread the optimistic idealism of the Concord sages

in the Mississippi Valley and ultimately enticed many Westerners to New England on philosophical and cultural pilgrimages, there arose in 1879 the scheme of organizing under Alcott's leadership a summer school of philosophical discussion that would meet the obvious needs of men and women all over the country. The moving spirit of the Concord School of Philosophy was the Hegelian philosopher and Public School Superintendent William T. Harris, of St. Louis, the editor of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, while lecturers and pupils came from all over the western states. In the course of the ten years that the school flourished, men like John Fiske and William James gave courses and even Emerson once lectured on memory. It was all a popular affair and not without certain comic aspects for the practical Yankees among whom these woolly idealists carried on⁸ and so it got considerable space in the daily press both of Boston and the other large cities of the land. The proceedings were usually extremely peaceful and harmless so far as the general public was concerned, but in the summer of 1886 there was an explosion. For in a lecture on "The Irony of Plato", the lecturer, "Professor" Thomas Davidson, had raised Emile Zola, the notorious French "apostle of dirt", among the great benefactors of mankind and placed him beside Aristotle, Goethe and even Jesus Christ! It was only done in passing, but it raised an uproar and went the rounds of the American press in endless reverberation. It was the turning point in Zola's career in America.

Thomas Davidson⁹ had been born 46 years before of poor parents in Scotland, had studied at Aberdeen and then come as a young man via Canada to the United States. At Boston he had been touched by the prevalent radical positivism of the time, but in St. Louis, where he was given a position as director of one of the public schools, he passed under the influence of Harris and his German idealism. With the enormous energy that was characteristic of him he read himself into German philosophy, passing on to Plato and ending up with Aristotle, whose chief prophet in America he became. In 1875 he settled at Boston as a free-lance writer and lecturer and soon his powerful personality with its staunch individualism, its high ethical aspirations and its deep religious fervour became a familiar figure on the "lyceum" platforms of the country. Davidson was a fluent linguist and master of all the languages of Western Europe, as well as of most of their literatures and philosophies. Naturally he was one of the main-stays of the Concord School from the very beginning, lecturing on Greek literature and art, as well as on various less tangible, more transcendental subjects. He was vigorously and practically interested in the problems of society, making various experiments that all had the fate of their kind. He was one of the leaders of popular adult education

⁸ cf. Austin Warren's finely ironical description of the school in *The New England Quarterly*, vol. II, no. 2, p. 199 ff. (April 1929.)

⁹ Mr. Edwards caught the wrong Davidson! It was not J. W. but Thomas. Cf. Prof. Bakewell's article in the *Dict. Am. Biogr.* Wm. James wrote a reminiscent essay on him in *Memories and Studies*.

in the country and what he said carried weight in thousands of American homes.

Davidson met Zola and his critics squarely on the moralistic plane. There is no word about his art. Zola is appraised solely as a teacher, and, to judge from the reports of the lecture printed in the papers,¹⁰ in the proximity of the great teachers of mankind. That was a high line to take and would have aroused opposition among more philosophical people than the Concord School were. It was no wonder that the newspapers voiced their indignant dissent. But Davidson knew what he was saying and stuck to his guns. Actually, though the words as repeated were his, they were not in this form a fair report of his lecture or of the occasion of the reference to Zola¹¹, and Davidson sent a long letter to the *Boston Daily Advertiser* giving a correct version of how it all came about and then going on to explain his position with regard to Zola more fully. This letter, which concerns itself entirely and exclusively with the French novelist, is Davidson's real contribution to the discussion. It is dated at Concord on July 28th, 1886, and was printed in the *Advertiser* the following day.

"I am sure that it was out of kindly regard for my reputation", Davidson begins, with an irony that shows that even a man of his intellectual courage might be slightly daunted by the Mrs. Grundy of the Gilded Age, "that you represented me in your issue of last Saturday as having 'predicted the speedy coming of a cordial toleration of M. Zola's works'. Yet this was not in any sense what I did, though I did say that the present howl against him would soon cease. My offence, if offence there was, was a more heinous one. I gave advice to the members of the Concord School in these terms: 'Let us not join in this cry, remembering that Socrates, in his day, was put to death for atheism and for corrupting the youth of Athens; that Jesus was crucified for blasphemy; that when Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister" was translated into English it was saluted with a howl, as being immoral and corrupting In the whole range of literature I know of no more cool, calm, terrible irony than that of Zola'

My reference to Zola came about in the following way; I was trying to classify the different kinds of irony and to name examples of each. Zola exhibits, in a most striking way, a kind of irony of which I know no other good example — what I have called the 'irony of the Day of Judgment', a day when, it is said, the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, including, we may well believe, some very 'nasty' secrets. I found that this irony of Zola's might be included in a class of irony, which I chose to call the 'irony of belief', as opposed to the 'irony of scepticism or cynicism'. The other ironies of the same class I found to be those of Socrates, Aristotle, Jesus, and Goethe. It was in this very innocent way that I came to put together the names of Zola and Jesus ..." Davidson then points out that

¹⁰ Mr. Edwards quotes the passage from *The Literary World*, Aug. 7, 1886.

¹¹ The headlines in the newspapers ran: ZOLA DEFENDED! as if that had been the main business not only of Davidson's lecture but of all the proceedings of the School!

Jesus himself consorted occasionally with men given to "nasty" forms of vice and that from His point of view pride is a more deadly sin than even "the reports of the police in the divorce courts, whose publication is now so justly reprobated". He then continues:

"But it may be asked: If you think that the publication of the reports of the police and the divorce courts is 'justly reprobated', how can you ask anyone to withhold his reprobation from Zola's novels? This is the point to which I wish to come. And, first of all, I wish to say that I reprobate most sincerely the publication of unclean and exciting details of vice in any of the public prints. In the second place, I should be heartily glad if we could afford to burn all Zola's social novels, and to forget that they ever existed, just as I should be glad if we could burn up everything that reminds us of vice or crime. But we cannot afford to do this for the simple reason that vice and its consequences, degradation and suffering, still exist, and so long as they exist, it is highly desirable that they should be clearly understood by us, not only in their actuality, but in their causes, conditions and ultimate effects. We can never expect to better a thing until we clearly comprehend its nature, its causes and its effects.

"Newspaper reports of vice and crime labor, for the most part, under this great defect, that they merely record disagreeable facts which repel the pure-minded and attract the impure-minded, in the former case doing no good, in the latter doing harm, in neither pointing the way to any remedy or arousing men's minds to apply any such. They are, therefore, deserving of entire reprobation. Zola's novels, on the contrary, while reporting the same facts, present them to us in their connection, show us their causes in existing social or other institutions, and their effects upon men's lives and characters, and so at once suggest a remedy and rouse us to apply it. No one who has read Zola's novels understandingly will ever think of denying this; but I am quite aware that persons do read them who see no earnest purpose in them, and who carry away from them only what some tourists carry away from Cologne — a sense of bad smells. Such persons, of course, ought not to read them, just as they ought not to read any book that depicts vice without suggesting to them the means of remedy. Among my audience at Concord I think I had a right to assume that no such persons were present.

"But it will perhaps be said: 'M. Zola might have accomplished his purpose without presenting all those disgusting details with which his books teem. He might have merely suggested things, or even given them a presentable aspect'. Here is the kernel of the whole matter. Most people object to Zola not because he depicts vice, but because he does not make it attractive. If he would make it attractive, as Alfred de Musset, 'Ouida' and many other writers do, they would have nothing to say. The truth is they want to play with vice and Zola will not let them. One of the chief merits of Zola's works I hold to be, that they present vice as it is, in all its prosaic, dull, heartless, disgusting nakedness. No man has ever made vice so unlovely, so sickening as Zola has done. He puts his vicious

people into a hell upon earth, compared with which Dante's *Inferno* is a land of romance. If any man can fall in love with vice from Zola's presentation of it, then there is no hope for him in this world or the next.

"At the present day, we need, above all things, to be aroused to a keen sense of the low moral and spiritual condition, and of the hideous lives of a large number of our fellow creatures. The current literature of the day — the novels and tales which form the staple of most people's reading — not only fails to do this, but positively contributes to blind men to the true condition of things. They merely skim the respectable surface of society, leaving its dark depths unsounded. This is, after all, the meaning of the "light touch" so highly recommended by our popular novelists — dear, sweet, finicking creatures, who shrink in prim horror from a manly grasp of anything. Touch the burning social questions of the day? Oh, dear! Not they. That would be unaesthetic. And so in their lightly touched souls they build their little palaces of art, ignorant of what monsters and ghosts lie slumbering in the dungeons underneath, what basilisks lurk in the undergrowth outside. I firmly believe that nine tenths of our hypocritical, emasculated, superficial, love-lorn novel literature is far more demoralizing than the true, faithful, manly work of Zola ...

"I am sorely afraid that those who condemn Zola's books are either those who have never read them or those who are so shallow as to be unable to appreciate their meaning and earnest purpose. That such persons should see no difference between these and such abominations as Prevost's 'Manon Lescaut', now flaunted in an edition de luxe in our shop windows, Daudet's 'Sapho' or the works of Eugene Sue and Alfred de Musset, I can well understand; but surely these are not our guides or legislators in matters of reading. Zola is one of the ablest and most earnest writers of our time; his later books are the best studies in social economy I know. I wish I dared predict 'the speedy coming' not only of 'cordial toleration', but also of a careful perusal of them by all serious minded persons. I cannot imagine any such person rising from the perusal of 'Germinal' for instance, without an enlarged insight into the nature, causes and effects of vice, a deepened sympathy with human suffering, and a strengthened determination to use his best endeavors to make that vice and that suffering cease."

This was a spirit different from that of Howells and James and Brander Matthews! It was a language Zola himself would have been the first to endorse. As criticism it may have been exceeding weak, but as moralistic pugilism it was magnificent. Its immediate effect seems to have been the silence that usually follows a knock-out; *The Critic* printed a short news-item in 1887 to the effect that there was a revolt among Zola's followers in France and *The Nation* published three letters from its readers setting forth in argumentative terms Zola's idealism. (Cf. *The Critic*, Sept. 10, 1887, p. 132; *The Nation*, vol. 45, pp. 417, 505 and 525.) The rest was stillness. And then, in 1888, appeared *Le Rêve*, translated by Cox in Peterson's edition, and sent the whole critical world of America — *venia sit ...!* —

raving! *The Literary World* called it "one of the most exquisite romances in the French or any other language, told with a beauty of style which a poor translator cannot conceal". *The Critic* styled it "a snowdrop growing among weeds", "perilously beautiful, tantalizingly sad". (*Lit. Wld.*, 1888, p. 541; *Critic*, 1888, p. 271.) Both verdicts were typically and irredeemably romantic and hardly adequate as measures of Zola's art; it is the peculiar character of this one book that met the wishes and standards of the American critics, and their enthusiasm is a gauge of their relief. As *The Critic* expressed it: "Should one ask us whether to read Zola, we should say: 'No, read "The Dream", for that is not Zola' ". Which, after all, was true. It shows that the average reviewer had been pummeled into respect for the Frenchman's powers, but not by any means won to sympathy for him.

Le Rêve, however, which had appeared late in the year, was not the real test. That was the advent in America of *La Terre* in Cox's translation, in the spring of 1888. Even in the expurgated version offered by Peterson's this most violently naturalistic of Zola's novels would, under normal circumstances, have raised a storm of opposition. But nothing of the kind happened. It was even Howells himself who led off in March with a favorable appreciation in *Harper's Magazine*, taking the sociological line so thumpingly laid down by Davidson. This "awfulest" of Zola's books, he says, "filthy and repulsive as it is in its facts, is a book not to be avoided by the student of civilisation, but rather to be sought and seriously considered". For, he continues, "it legitimately addresses itself to scientific curiosity and humane interest". He gives a short sketch of the historical reasons for the conditions Zola presents in his book, regarding them as "effects of the old repressions which stifled religious thought" among peasants, and winding up with the remark that, "since with all its literary power, its wonderful force of realization, it cannot remain valuable as literature, ... it seems a great pity it should not have been fully documented". This touches, of course, the essence of the problematic character of the whole book. "What are the sources, the proofs of this tremendous charge against humanity?"¹² The review, in its admiration and its doubts, was eminently fair. Howells was not in a position to measure the truthfulness of Zola's picture of French peasant life, though he was more than ready to accept Zola's judgment, the word peasant in itself denoting for him as for the great majority of Anglo-Saxon minds a state of degradation. The slight reserve as to the degree of Zola's veracity does not essentially impair the impression that Howells was here embracing Zola as a true historian of his time, and American criticism of the book immediately followed in his footsteps.

For Howells's word, of course, was law among the rest of the tribe, and it is no surprise that *The Critic*, in its review of the same book on May 26th, expanded his ideas and incidentally added echoes from Davidson as well.

¹² *Harper's Magazine*, March 1888, vol. 76, p. 641 f. I could not find the passage quoted by Mr. Edwards as being by Howells at the place he indicates.

"The bestiality of Zola", it says, "has this excuse: that it is the bestiality of a class that could not well be otherwise than bestial. It is of a kind also to rouse a profound sense of the terrors, the dangers, the revenges to which the state and the aristocratic classes are exposing themselves by their indifference to the degradation and the suffering of such a class as is represented in *La Terre*". The story as such is rejected as being dull, slow and unpleasant; but for the intentions of its author the reviewer has more than a kind word. "It is possible to perceive in Zola", he says, "a desire, not to wallow in sensuality for its own sake, but to rouse the student to a sense of what sensuality, constant degradation, intolerable and irremediable poverty and hopeless physical suffering will lead the peasant class to, born as they are without higher instincts and bred as they are without noble teaching to ward off natural consequences". More unreservedly and more innocently than Howells this reviewer discloses how completely Zola's book has dropped into his preconceived American notion of European society and especially of the peasant, and there is no doubt that this bias was a considerable help to the American reader at large in his endeavor to do Zola justice. An uncritical and sometimes silly prejudice was ultimately the bridge across which the French novelist finally marched into American favor!

La Terre was the camel compared to which, once swallowed, all the rest of Zola's books were mere gnats. Besides, the books that came after were less open to exception than the earlier ones had been, and once the sociological viewpoint was recognized as the proper one for a just appreciation of Zola, they were far more easily appraised. The *Trois Villes* and *Quatre Evangiles* were essentially treatises on various comprehensive problems of society and were taken for nothing more. "M. Zola," says the *Literary World* of *L'Argent*, translated by Benjamin R. Tucker in 1891 (p. 141), "has studied every aspect of money-getting and money-holding; he has not spared a detail of the vileness, of every kind and degree, which money can induce". Judgments of this kind reflect the new attitude to Zola's own newness of attitude, and they reflect as well the new generation in America itself that was now turning its attention to social problems in its own domain. It was the age of Populism, of the Chicago strikes, of Henry George and Edward Bellamy and of the rise of the new realism in the American novel. For this generation Zola was no longer a problem — "we were all reading Zola", Robert Herrick once said — and the criticism that occasionally is adverse is so dispassionately and on sympathetic grounds. In October 1890 *The Overland Monthly* at San Francisco published a long article by C. W. Bardeen on "Zola's Rougon-Macquart Family", in which the moralistic and the artistic points of view are combined. "There is not in all his works a licentious page", the obviously young critic declares, and Zola is above all a conscientious artist. "He believes in his work; he has wrought into it his life and heart and soul; and with all its blemishes I believe he has accomplished the greatest literary achievement of the younger men of this generation".

And a few years later B. W. Wells, writing in the first volume of the *Sewanee Review* (Aug. 1893) on "Zola and Literary Naturalism", makes the revealing statement that "in spite of all, in spite of himself, Zola is not a naturalist, but rather the greatest of living French idealists and since Victor Hugo's death first of her prose poets". That was high praise — and deep insight as well.

The final acceptance of Zola, coinciding as it did with the rise of a new realism in American literature itself, denoted a split in the literary life of the United States. While the new realists — Crane and Norris and Herrick — struck out for new fields and new methods, the older romanticism stubbornly kept to its ways, and the middle nineties saw a revival of the historical romance that led from Weir Mitchell to Cabell in our own day. For this public the literary Zola remained essentially what he had always been, and it was not till he appealed to the romantic strain in the American general public, i.e. not till he had become a hero in their eyes, that he captured their hearts. The final conquest of America was only accomplished by the Zola of the Dreyfus case; but by then American "naturalism" itself was well under way and did not need him any more.

Basel, Switzerland.

H. LÜDEKE.

Cranford

We may, I think, safely say that when the name of Mrs. Gaskell is mentioned every one of us will at once mentally pronounce the word: *Cranford*. In the minds of many this will remain the only association the name calls up, in those of others there will follow some more titles of her novels and probably her Brontë-biography, but even with these knowing ones *Cranford* will have come first and quite spontaneously, the other works only slowly, with more or less effort, however good and interesting and important they may judge these novels to be.

The reason is that *Cranford* is not only a more harmonious whole, a better, artistically purer work, but that it stands apart from all her other books, that it has a different character and a different appeal. For once the author sets aside the weightier problems, social and moral, that often occupied her; she indulges in reminiscences of her stay at Knutsford and does nothing but describe the simple life which she had enjoyed so much and to which memory and imagination had lent an even greater charm, a truly idyllic glow. It need not astonish us that the book was hailed with delight by her contemporaries. Even if it had been much less clever and refined, it would still have been joyfully accepted and eagerly read: it is so perfectly in accordance with the spirit of the time, so exactly calculated to meet the demands of the mid-Victorian public. The wonder is that, unlike many other books of the kind, it should have kept its attraction for later generations even to the present day, in spite of many characteristics that militate

against this. And it has not only a popular appeal, it is generally recognized as one of the minor classics of English literature, praised by the most discriminating readers, the severest critics.

Cranford is not a novel in the proper sense of the word, but rather a series of sketches and stories, somewhat in the manner of the Dutch *Camera Obscura*, but more closely connected, because they all deal with the life of one particular little community. It paints a picture of life in the country, in a very small, sequestered, village-like town. In the multitude of descriptions of village-life that we possess, we may, roughly speaking, distinguish two definite tendencies. From a very early date the country, the simple life far from the madding crowd, have, both in prose and poetry, been extolled, painted in the brightest colours, put over against the evils of the feverish existence in the city. God made the country, and man made the town. But side by side with the rosy, idealized pictures, there have always appeared, especially after the rise of realism, descriptions of an entirely different character, the authors apparently taking a pleasure in depicting the ugly aspects of life in the country, angered perhaps by the obviously false views of the idealists. In American literature, where we find the same contrasting tendencies, they have even led to a definite, long-maintained controversy. Of course there are also more neutral descriptions, in which the light and shade are more naturally divided, but very often the author will be found biassed either one way or the other, and there are not a few extreme examples. Now *Cranford* decidedly belongs to the type of pictures in which a rosy, idyllic view prevails, and it is a notorious fact that it is much more difficult to make us accept such a picture as a serious artistic work than its opposite, the one in which a sordid, gloomy view is expressed, however much this latter may also be exaggerated. This holds good for all times, even for periods in which people are inclined to take a cheerful view of life. To paint in bright colours has indeed always proved to be an arduous and risky task; and we have become much more critical and sceptical than Mrs. Gaskell's contemporaries. The least false touch in such a picture spoils the whole effect. Yes, we say, this is all very fine, but the artist only tries to console us, and himself; he has not really seen and experienced this. he is not sincere, not true to his own vision; and we cannot any longer give him the "willing suspension of disbelief" essential to artistic enjoyment, his work only rouses our anger, it irritates us. Not so in the case of *Cranford*. From the beginning we are charmed, the skepticism with which we may have started vanishing as if by magic. For the time being we live in a new, delightful little world, and to the very end there is nothing to disturb the illusion, the enjoyment. How is it, we may well ask ourselves, that in *Cranford* the author has succeeded in compelling even the modern reader — prejudiced probably against anything that seems to smack of the idyllic, the sentimental in ever so small a degree — to accept her vision, if perhaps only temporarily, as true to life, while so many other similar attempts have woefully failed? Of course it is impossible to answer this question satisfactorily. The mystery of talent, of genius can never be completely revealed.

But some of the reasons why the reader of *Cranford* finds it easy to surrender himself to its charm, to maintain the necessary suspension of disbelief undisturbed to the end of the book, may, I think, be discovered.

The little world, the community which the authoress wanted to depict is different from our own, from our experiences of the real world, and even from what we may perhaps imagine such a community to have been. She must therefore persuade us to a belief that yet it is possible, that such lives were indeed led by the inhabitants of the little town, and one of the chief means she has used — either consciously or unconsciously — to convince us from the outset of this possibility, I would call for convenience' sake: "isolation." From the beginning our preconceived notions of life in a little town are subtly undermined, suppressed, removed altogether and the author achieves this by isolating her picture of this particular little town, by separating it, as much as could safely be done, from the reader's experiences real or imaginative. The life we read of is strange, peculiar, but then we are at once given to understand that this was so, because the circumstances under which it was led, were peculiar, very different indeed from our own. First of all it all happen in an indefinite remote period of the past, in those quiet times of which we may have heard vague reports from our grandparents; then Cranford was a very sequestered place, more than twenty miles distant from the nearest town, and the means of communication were in a very primitive state. This remoteness in time and place is repeatedly suggested by all sorts of subtle touches, by frequent references to old-fashioned dresses, to ancient customs, to the difficulty of knowing what went on in the world outside, so that the reader is never in danger of forgetting the peculiar remoteness of the little world in which for the time being he lives in his imagination. But all this was not enough. Cranford must be still further separated from ordinary reality, from other places, its circumstances must be made even more peculiar, so that we may the more readily believe in the quaintness of the personages and forget the dangerous notions existing in our minds, dangerous, because doubts as to the possibility of Cranford life might easily arise from them. And the author has cleverly seen to this in the very first pages of her book, where we learn that "Cranford is in possession of the Amazons; all the holders of houses, above a certain rent, are women. If a married couple come to settle in the town, somehow the gentleman disappears; he is either fairly frightened to death by being the only man in the Cranford evening parties, or he is accounted for by being with his regiment, his ship, or closely engaged in business all the week in the great neighbouring commercial town of Drumble....." etc. Our attention is thus at once directed to the circumstance that very peculiar conditions obtained in Cranford, that it was a little town not only remote in place and time, but differing from all others of which we may have experience in that it was almost exclusively inhabited by women, or at least that men played only a very subsidiary part in its life. And this naturally makes us expect that we shall hear of somewhat peculiar events and relations in the little community. The author indeed immediately turns the advantage

provided by this initial statement to account by adding to it a few of the natural consequences of this predominance of ladies in the town. She tells us of some strange customs and conventions prevalent among them, of the indifference of these women to old-fashioned dresses, their strong *esprit de corps*, the tacit understanding that not one of them should ever mention or even think of the possibility of one of their friends being poor, etc. And so we gradually get to know more of this curious community, our preconceived notions about life in a little town safely laid to sleep, always with the thought at the bottom of our minds that Cranford was a peculiar place, where things of rare occurrence, improbable or impossible in other towns, may very well have been quite common and natural.

As said, the author has succeeded in awakening in us this favourable disposition of willing acceptance by what I called "isolation". But however useful, isolation alone would not have been sufficient. For one thing it must be used with the greatest care, the most perfect judgement; if carried too far it would do more harm than good. And besides, to have the desired effect it must be accompanied and even intimately fused with its very opposite, with "connection" — connection, that is to say, with common everyday reality, with the experience of every reader. This is partly secured by the circumstance that the I of the book, the narrator, does not herself belong to Cranford. She lives in another town, in an altogether different milieu, and derives her knowledge of Cranford from occasional visits to it and from letters and reports that reach her about what is going on in the little place. Thus we are made to see everything through the eyes of an outsider. We are not confronted with the curious community alone and unaided, we are introduced to it by a representative of the ordinary world of men, one to whom Cranford seems as quaint and curious as it does to ourselves. She is "one of us," so to say, we readily identify ourselves with her and her views and opinions. The connection thus established between wonderful little Cranford and the more familiar world outside it, facilitates the conquest of our incredulity. H. G. Wells has used a very similar device to excellent purpose in his romances and Utopias, the fanciful world not being revealed to the reader by direct description but by means of a fictitious narrator, an average individual identified with the world as we know it,¹ and as a matter of fact other examples might be given of this advantage afforded by the autobiographical method of narration.

But of far greater importance is another sort of "connection" between the imaginary world and the real one of our own experience: the author's power of convincing characterisation. For, however curious the inhabitants of Cranford may be in some respects, they have remained real human beings. Their oddities, their strange customs and conventions only affect the surface, not the inner being, the essential humanity of the characters. It is true that Mrs. Gaskell does not give us a profound insight into the minds of the personages; her vision does not penetrate very far, but what she sees she

¹ See my review of *Men like Gods*, E. S. VI (1924), 39—45.

sees very clearly and she possesses in a high degree the gift of rendering her impressions, of communicating them to us. And then the theme of the book, and the aim she had in view in treating it, did not call for a very penetrating vision. It is simple people that she depicts in *Cranford*, in their quiet, everyday existence, and any attempt at minute psychological analysis or at entering the mysterious regions of the subconscious would of course only have counteracted the desired effect, disturbed the harmony of the idyll.

The genuine humanity of the personages, always perceptible under their curious manners and conduct, is a powerful agent in making us accept the whole little community as real, believe for a time in everything the author tells us and thus in creating the mood in us necessary for the enjoyment of a work of art. Yet another factor contributing to this is the consistency which the author has maintained throughout the book, the unity of the whole rambling series of sketches and stories. The note struck in the beginning is admirably sustained. She has seen Cranford as a quaint, a very quiet and amiable community, a little world in which it was good to live, and whatever happens, whatever she may discover in it, she remains faithful to her original conception. Life at Cranford has its dark, its tragic sides, but they do not disturb the vision, the tone of idyllic, somewhat wistful happiness. It is obvious that it was a congenial theme she chose here, and the treatment of it a labour of love, performed with the greatest zest and pleasure. She knew the little town of Knutsford and its inhabitants very well, and though no doubt she invented many incidents and altered most of the personages the picture is clearly based on reality, another strong connecting link. She depicted this community as it lived in her memory, writing the book several years after she had left Knutsford, and we all know that the past, especially periods in which on the whole we were happy, takes on a more beautiful aspect when we look back upon it, a warm, serene glow, even though mixed with melancholy. *Cranford* is essentially such a recollection, the impression of a distant past as it lived in the mind of a very sensitive, artistic woman, and rendered with absolute loyalty and sincerity in all its various phases. This consistency — seemingly easy, in reality very difficult to maintain — also greatly contributes to the illusion of truth to life. — It can only be achieved when the artist has had a strong impression and has remained sincere in rendering it. Any pretence, any attempt at beautifying immediately betrays itself to a sensitive reader, especially in an idyllic picture like this, painted in bright colours, and destroys his belief and consequently his æsthetic enjoyment.

Yet all the qualities mentioned would not have availed in making *Cranford* the delightful book it is. Mrs. Gaskell possessed one more gift, the inestimable gift of humour. It is present everywhere, it tinges almost every scene and, in perfect accordance with the nature of the incident that is related, it assumes various shades and nuances; it ranges from whimsical fun and drollery to quizzical mocking and to that humour of a graver and higher order which is charged with deep feeling and closely allied to pathos.

The ladies of Cranford, however sweet and kind-hearted — much more so indeed than most mortals — are not perfect angels. They have their shortcomings, class-consciousness, backbiting and jealousy being by no means unknown among them, and on some few occasions the inhabitants of Cranford even show weaknesses of a more serious character. The authoress, far from whitewashing them, fearlessly exposes their faults, but always with a smile, with gentle raillery. It never becomes harsh, it never passes into irony or satire, which would only have disturbed the harmony of tone in the idyll, but it is effective enough for all that. The author's sense of humour, however, found its widest scope in the oddities of behaviour and appearance, in the manners and customs, the harmless peculiarities of the inhabitants. In all the stories and descriptions there is a tone of gentle mockery, subdued but clearly perceptible, greatly enhancing their charm, while it sometimes serves at the same time to emphasize the impression of "isolation," as, to give only one instance, in the delightful skit on the Miss Jenkynses' excessive care for their new carpet: "..... We were very busy, too, one whole morning, before Miss Jenkyns gave her party, in following her directions, and in cutting out and stitching together pieces of newspaper so as to form little paths to every chair set for the expected visitors, lest their shoes might dirty or defile the purity of the carpet. Do you make paper paths for every guest to walk upon in London?"

But in other ways, too, the humour permeating the whole book furthers our willingness to believe in the imaginary world put before our eyes. It reassures us, as it were; it shows us so clearly that the narrator will not allow herself to be deceived by appearances, to be carried away by her feelings or by the desire to paint everything more brightly and beautifully than the reality of her remembrance. It makes us much more ready to accept her vision than if the tone had been serious throughout. It has enabled the author to carry off triumphantly scenes dangerously bordering on sentimentality, and to make use at times of improbable coincidence and chance without vexing the reader or even disturbing the illusion of truth to life.

Much more might be said about the delicate art displayed in *Cranford*, the subtle and original characterisation, the deftness with which even quite subsidiary personages and mere mutes are sketched in; the way in which the humour and pathos — which even in the work of the best writers often exist only side by side, refusing to mingle — are here intimately connected, inseparably fused; the great inventive power of peculiar and picturesque detail, which has made stories bald and threadbare and conventional in their main themes into "something rich and strange." But all this would lead us too far at present, the object of this short paper being only to indicate some of the features of the book that contribute to the willing suspension of disbelief which Coleridge rightly considered one of the essential conditions for the æsthetic enjoyment of literature.

Notes and News

Eilert Ekwall

1877—1942

On the eighth of next January, Professor Eilert Ekwall, the well-known philologist of Lund University, Sweden, reaches the age of sixty-five, and retires from the chair of English which he has held for a long succession of years. In view of this it has been thought fitting that some notice of his life and work should appear in *English Studies*, of which he is a co-editor.

Ekwall was born at Vallsjö in the province of Jönköping. After leaving the grammar school of the county town, he entered Uppsala University, where at the early age of 26 he took his doctor's degree with a thesis on *Shakespeare's Vocabulary: its Etymological Elements*. The interest in etymology and linguistics shown by this and others of his earliest publications — an interest stimulated by contacts with the famous linguistic school at Uppsala — was to become the key-note of his later work, and even in his thesis for the doctorate Ekwall made a good many lasting contributions to English etymology. It got him a docentship at Uppsala University, which he later left for that of Gothenburg. After the division, in 1904, of the old chair of Germanic languages at Lund University, Ekwall became the first ordinary occupant of the newly created chair of English, a post which he has held ever since, and the bulk of his work belongs to his Lund period.

After an excursion into the field of Germanic word-formation, in his *Suffixet -ja i senare leden av sammansatta substantiv inom de germanska språken* (1904), Ekwall turned to the study of early modern English, a study which claimed his main interest for several years, and which resulted in a number of articles and monographs. His *Zur Geschichte der stimmhaften interdentalen Spirans im Englischen* appeared in 1906 (also *Weiteres zur Geschichte der stimmhaften interdentalen Spirans im Englischen*, Englische Studien, 1907). Editions of *D:r John Jones's Practical Phonography* and of the *Writing Scholars Companion* were published in *Neudrucke frühneuengl. Grammatiken*, and in his *Historische neuenglische Laut- und Formenlehre*, issued in Sammlung Göschen in 1914 (second ed. 1922), he dealt with early modern English sound development and accidence. To this period also belongs his *Origin and History of the Unchanged Plural in English* (1912), which is largely based on modern English material.

Ekwall was early attracted to the field in which he was to become a pioneer, the study of place-names. In his earlier publications on place-names he generally attacked a definite linguistic or historical problem with the aid of place-names. Thus his *Contributions to the History of Old English Dialects* (1917) furnish valuable material towards the determination of the Saxon-Anglian dialect boundary, and *Scandinavians and Celts in the North-west of England* (1918) clears up the part played by Norwe-

gians from Irish settlements in the Scandinavian colonization of England. His monograph on *English Place-names in -ing* (1923) is an important contribution to early racial history, besides explaining many difficult place-names. Numerous shorter contributions dealing with phonological problems appeared in periodicals, for instance *O.E. Gyrwe, Ae. botl, bold, boðl in englischen Ortsnamen, Loss of a Nasal before Labial Consonants* (Klaeber Misc.), etc. Ekwall thus combined place-name and phonological research, causing these branches of philology mutually to bear on each other. This principle is characteristic of much of his later work, and of his activity as a lecturer. In the series of lectures on English sound history which, for many years, he gave at Lund University, Ekwall, wherever possible, used place-names to illustrate phonetic laws, and to determine their sphere of operation.

The *Place-names of Lancashire*, published in 1922 by the University of Manchester and the Chetham Society, introduced new principles into English place-name research. Ekwall here uses the methods of arrangement and of presenting the material employed by Norwegian and Swedish scholars, and later adopted by the English Place-Name Society. In other respects, too, it marked an epoch in English place-name study. It was unrivalled among English place-name monographs for scholarship, thoroughness and stringency of method. When, in 1923, the English Place-Name Society was founded, Ekwall was elected to its Committee, and since then he has been a frequent collaborator in the annual volumes of the Society. Ekwall next concentrated on the study of river-names. His monograph *English River-names*, published by the Oxford University Press in 1928, offers a full treatment of river-names, and of the part played by them in the formation of place-names. Based on a comprehensive collection of material, it clears up many extremely difficult problems, and by its combination of Celtic and English scholarship it deals with its subject in a way which it will not be easy to surpass. It is a truly monumental work.

Much of the time that elapsed after the publication of his *River-names*, Ekwall spent on the preparation of his place-name dictionary, which was published at Oxford in 1936, and its companion volumes (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-names* (second ed. 1940); *Studies on English Place- and Personal Names*, 1931; *Studies on English Place-names*, 1936; and articles, like *Etymological Notes* (three series, 1928-9); *The English Place-names Drayton, Draycot, Drax*, 1932; *Names of Trades in English Place-names*, 1933; etc.). Two principles stand out clearly in these volumes: the principle of comparative study and that of synthesis. Many solutions of intricate problems were possible only by the aid of comparative material taken from the vocabulary or place-names of other Germanic languages, a method in the employment of which much early place-name work fell lamentably short. The urging of comparative methods thus raised English place-name research to a higher standard of efficiency and accuracy than it had reached before. Again, the synthesis it attains of the material is one of the great achievements of the place-name dictionary (and its companion volumes), whereby it avoids one of the pitfalls of the county

monograph. Many striking illustrations are afforded by these volumes of the value of dealing with place-name groups, rather than with the names one by one. In this field, too, the dictionary and its companion volumes lead the way. Among Ekwall's latest publications we may note some articles on general etymological problems, for instance, *The Etymology of the word Tinker* (*English Studies* 1936); *English Fond*; *Middle English O bon*, and his latest contribution to *English Studies*, in its August number.

Ekwall is well-known as a reviewer, and his notices have appeared in a wide variety of periodicals. He is editor of the Lund philological series *Lund Studies in English*, which was initiated in 1933.

The preceding notes by no means exhaust the list of Ekwall's publications, but they indicate the main lines along which his work has developed. It is difficult to realize that his still vigorous and youthful personality should have exhausted its usefulness to the university he has served for so many years. Yet the loss to his pupils will be the gain of science, for he will be able to devote his undivided energies to the branch of research which he has cultivated with so great ability and success. No doubt we can look forward to many, more weighty contributions from Ekwall's pen.

Lund.

O. S. ANDERSON.

The Conclusive Perfect. In view of what Dr. G. Kirchner, in his article in the October number, calls the "unbroken chain of Germanic usage," attention may be drawn to a note in A. H. Smith's edition of *The Parker Chronicle* (832-900) in Methuen's *Old English Library*. On p. 44 the sentence from the annal for 893: "Ac hi hæfdon þa heora stemn gesetenne and hiora mete genotudne," is translated: "they had (or 'they were there with') their tour of duty complete and their food consumed." Compare with this Dr. K.'s quotation from Curme: "I have my garden spaded and ready for planting."

The following instance of the construction with *to have got* was found in J. Masfield, *The Bird of Dawning* (Albatross ed., p. 232/3): "Ah, yes, sir," Fairford said, as he watched, "you can glance and you can curse the helmsman, but the Bird of Dawning's got you beat to the wide."

Lastly, another example of the Anglo-Irish perfect with *to be after* + -ing: "Moynihan ... began to call with the voice of a slobbering urchin. — Please, teacher! This boy is *after saying* a bad word, teacher." (J. Joyce, *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Travellers' Library, p. 219.) — Z.

Reviews

The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More.
By C. R. THOMPSON. 52 pp. Ithaca, New York. 1940.

The present study is a revised part of the author's unpublished Princeton University doctoral dissertation, *Lucian and Lucianism in the English Renaissance* (1937). The fact that Lucian's influence on English literature has received very little attention so far and the scholarly qualities of the fragment before us make us hope that Dr. Thompson's complete book will soon be made available to all students of the English and Continental Renaissance. It is true, both Erasmus and More wrote their Latin translations of Lucian in their early years, and saw in them something of the nature of an exercise which helped to improve their knowledge of Greek, the technique of the philosophical dialogue, and good style generally. This is not to say that they respected their author merely for his language and manner; his matter interested them no less. His ironic spirit, his high efficiency in laughing all kinds of human superstitions and absurdities from the stage, had a powerful attraction for the authors of *Moriae Encomium* and *Utopia*. They were not seriously shocked by Lucian's occasional levity and his irreligious tendencies. "For why should it concern me what a pagan thinks about those matters that are contained in the peculiar mysteries of the Christian faith?" asked More, and proceeded undisturbed in his enjoyment of writings in which he found delight and instruction at the same time. That Erasmus and More were not alone in their appreciation of the Samosatensian is shown by the considerable number of editions through which their translations went.

Erasmus returned more often to Lucian than More did, and translated more of his writings. He followed the Greek text (probably the one published by Aldus in 1503) fairly literally, though not slavishly. More's method was similar; however, he was accused of exorbitant literalness by a later interpreter of Lucian. A little more information concerning the stylistic qualities of the translations than Dr. Thompson has included in his essay would, in my opinion, be gratefully received by most of his readers.

Having characterized the versions of the two humanists one by one, the author concludes his competent piece of work by paying special attention to their translations of *Tyrannicida*, a Lucianic oration, to which Erasmus as well as More composed an answer. It is probable that they discussed their plan of attacking the somewhat specious argument of Lucian's speaker, because their replies follow similar lines of reasoning. In style, however, they differ: the brevity and trenchancy of More's speech betrays the lawyer, whereas Erasmus' ornate elaborateness is that of the literary man.

Basel.

RUDOLF STAMM.

Milton, Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises, Translated from the Latin by PHYLLIS B. TILLYARD. With an Introduction and Commentary by E. M. W. TILLYARD. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1932. Pp. xl — 144. Price 10/6.

The Miltonic Setting Past and Present. By E. M. W. TILLYARD. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1938. Pp. xii—208. Price 7/6.

Milton und Italien. Von Dr. ARTUR EGLE. Freiburg im Breisgau: Druck von Rudolf Goldschagg. 1940. Pp. 145. (Dissertation.)

John Milton. Di AUGUSTO GUIDI. Brescia: Morcelliana. 1940. Pp. 195. Price Lire 12.

The reawakened interest in Milton could not be better witnessed than by this short selection of studies, one by the foremost Milton scholar of England, the other two by young foreigners. If the tribute of the young is the dearest to the immortal poets as to the gods, the last mentioned book in our list should be given priority. Guidi's synthetic study is one of those critical sketches with which readers of Croce and his school are familiar. Of Milton's life only those aspects are outlined which bear upon his poetry; of his production, according to the Crocean formula *poesia — non poesia*, only that side is considered which interests lovers of poetry. Within these limits, Guidi's essay is nimble and convincing, instinct as it is with the freshness of a juvenile work undertaken with enthusiasm. Milton is for Guidi essentially an egoist: "non uscì mai fuori di se stesso", "poeta senza infanzia, e poeta senza amore, senza passione d'amore"; becoming blind was the fundamental and conclusive experience of his life. His message is an assertion of man's freedom, stressed even in the stoic resignation produced in the poet by the collapse of all his hopes and illusions and by the personal misfortune of blindness: a message which bears the tragical stamp of an almost irreligious religion. Perhaps, writes Guidi, life's true values — love, kindness, goodness — which Milton's eyes had never seen in their reality in the real world, were seen by him only with the eye of his mind, lost in a lost world, figures of a thwarted desire, fleeting and vague phantoms of a poetical world:

Sono questi fantasmi, che nascono peraltro anche essi da passioni e lotte vissute e talvolta vanamente sofferte, rievocate nel buio della cecità, ma si staccano nella calma luce della poesia, sono questi fantasmi la parte migliore e più vera del genio di Milton, ora avvolti, ora trasparenti dietro un velo prezioso e doloroso.

The essay is full of acute remarks on Milton's music, on his relation to the other sex ("the image of woman is constantly found associated in him with the image of flowers"), and on the anticipations of romantic sensibility which we notice in his "poesia individualistica, egocentrica e problematica",

Paradise Lost being, for all its classical form and the humanist culture implied, a great autobiographical novel which seems to announce, somewhat even in its structure, the psychological novel of modern times (the identification of the poet with the hero in *Samson Agonistes* is perhaps the first case of its kind in literature: it was destined to become the rule with the romantics). Guidi derives some suggestions from Tillyard's *Milton* (London 1934) (among others the comparison of the *Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity* to a "fifteenth-century Italian picture", which is quite off the mark; see Tillyard p. 37, Guidi p. 47), but on the whole people who seek for new points of view may be disappointed in not finding replies to what they consider vital problems in this straightforward aesthetic appreciation. In his courage in facing main issues which experienced scholars would undertake only after a lifelong study, Guidi follows the custom of all Italian generations under the influence of Croce; formerly, beginners used to start with research of the type of Dr. Egle's, whose *Milton und Italien* is a thorough survey of all the literature on the subject, brought up to date and occasionally supplemented with his own suggestions. A comprehensive study of this type had not been made since E. Allodoli's *Giovanni Milton e l'Italia* (Prato 1907), and was badly needed after Wright, Smart, Hanford, Schork, and others had thrown so much light on a number of doubtful points. Dr. Egle thinks that Milton owed his interest in Italian literature chiefly to his friend Diodati, confutes in a detailed and convincing way Liljegren's denial of Milton's visit to Galileo, showing that he would not have been the only foreigner to get over the restrictions imposed by the Inquisition on the astronomer (Dr. Egle's statements receive a flavour of thrilling adventure from his personal survey of Arcetri, Galileo's residence at the time of the alleged visit, and his inspecting the grounds in order to see how the vigilance of the Inquisition might have been eluded), places Milton's meeting with Galileo in April, 1639, very judiciously lays little stress on Milton's acquaintance with Andreini's *Adamo*, which has been again emphasized in recent times, and dismisses other alleged sources (among which Serafino della Salandra's *Adamo caduto*, brought forward also by "ein gewisser Douglas" (p. 99), i.e. the well-known author of *South Wind* and other delightful books, Norman Douglas), discusses the influence of Italian reformers and philosophers on Milton, and his reaction to Italian art (i.e. almost exclusively to Italian music, since he seems to have been as good as blind — Mutschmann actually suggested that Milton was an albino! — to masterpieces of Italian painting and architecture). Omissions in this thorough study are very few; but I do not see any mention of O. H. Moore's *Infernal Council* in *Modern Philology*, XIX, pp. 47-64, nor of my own study of the influence of Italian critical theories on Milton in an essay contributed to *Seventeenth Century Studies presented to Sir Herbert Grierson*, Oxford 1938). Unfortunately, there are several misprints in both Guidi's and Egle's books. Egle's quotations of foreign, chiefly Italian, passages teem with errors; accents and apostrophes are omitted or put in the wrong places, letters and entire

words dropped, etc., as may be seen from pages 28, 35, 54, 95, 97, 98, 103, 106, 109, 127, 136, 137; e.g. on p. 106 *avocuta* stands for *avventa* and *ciò tocca* ought to be *ciò che tocca*.

Prof. Tillyard's book is the most important item in our list; it collects studies, previously published elsewhere in reviews etc., on "*L'Allegro*" and "*Il Penseroso*", on *Milton and Keats*, on *Milton and primitive feeling*, on *Milton and prophetic poetry*, on *Milton and Protestantism*, on *Milton's visual imagination*, on *Milton and the epic*, and *A note on Milton's style*. The close connexion of Milton's two juvenile poems with his first *Academic Exercise*, (a translation of it is given by Phyllis B. Tillyard in the first work mentioned in our list, which is calculated to make accessible to a greater number of readers a group of works far from negligible, both for their historical interest and, at least in one case — the *Seventh Prolusion* —, their intrinsic value) is a discovery of Prof. Tillyard, from which he has derived a number of important implications; but surely that connexion hardly justifies his making fun of a passage in Masson's *Life of Milton* where the country scene of Horton is described as the background of *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, since, after stressing the academic inspiration of the two poems, Prof. Tillyard places them in the summer of 1631 and sees reflected in them the experience of the country holiday in the Long Vacation of 1631 (p. 25). Prof. Tillyard makes short shrift of Mr. Middleton Murry's critical vagaries, and effectively defends Milton's style against T. S. Eliot's and others' strictures (Mr. T. Earle Welby wrote of Milton's mature poems that "they are beyond description magnificent, but they are the arterio-sclerosis of English poetry"); he is disposed to agree with Mr. Blunden that *Paradise Regained* gives us (among other things) the perfection of the "Doric delicacy" attributed by Wotton to Milton's early verse and to see many small hints in *Paradise Lost* arguing that neither Milton's homeliness nor his tenderness nor his sensuousness had atrophied in that poem, and shows how much exaggeration there is in the opinion that Milton's style is entirely modelled on the Latin classics, and how absurd was Keats' contrast between Chatterton's alleged "native music" and "Milton's cut by feet".

Milton manipulated the Latin element in our vocabulary in yet another way: he constantly set it close to the lowliest simplicity:

The Sun that light imparts to all, receives
From all his alimantal recompence
In humid exhalations, and at Even
Sups with the Ocean.

This playing off the simple against the Latin element is central to the genius of the English language and as essential to Shakespeare and Thomas Browne as to Milton.

He contrasts the notion of Milton as an intellectual poet with that of a being much closer to primitive feeling than is generally supposed: "There are passages in Milton that reproduce more instinctively, and with less interposition of theory, than most passages from the Romantics, the primitive awe of wild nature". He agrees with Saurat, who first pointed

out the feeling Milton had for fertility, for exuberant life, and compares him to Rubens, but we fail to grasp his definition of Rubens as "that other great neo-classic exuberant of the seventeenth century". As we have remarked above apropos of the *Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*, we think that Prof. Tillyard's notions of styles of painting are rather vague. One of the most remarkable points made by Prof. Tillyard is his interpretation of Milton's Protestantism in its proper historical perspective; he finds it unfortunate that we should have to characterize him by the word Protestant, which still carries with it so many associations to which he is utterly alien. By far the most important of these essays is that on the English epic tradition and the growth of Milton's epic plans; Prof. Tillyard succeeds in showing us how little isolated Milton was from contemporary theory and practice; we need not see anything archaistic in the attempt at an *Arthuriad* in the years 1631 to 1639, after what we know from Miss Roberta F. Brinkley's *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore 1932). Miss Brinkley has shown that the legend of Arthur reincarnate had the fate of becoming associated with party politics; it became a Royalist affair; Prof. Tillyard thinks it probable that Milton, under the influence of Parliamentary thought, abandoned the legendary and Royalist Arthur for the historical and constitutional Alfred, until bitter disillusionment in his patriotic fervour turned him away from such a heroic poem. In *Paradise Lost*, it is Satan who embodies some of the heroic qualities and who in his voyagings satisfies Milton's oft-repeated allusions to the *Odyssey* of Homer. Thus the whole of Prof. Tillyard's book is designed to react against the notion of Milton as an isolated phenomenon in English literature: T. S. Eliot's note on the *Verse of John Milton* could not have been given a more detailed and learned reply.

Rome.

MARIO PRAZ.

Le roman et les idées en Angleterre. L'anti-intellectualisme et l'esthétisme (1880-1900). By MADELEINE L. CAZAMIAN. (Publications de la faculté des lettres de l'université de Strasbourg. Fascicule 73.) 348 pp. 8°. Paris. Société d'édition: Les belles lettres. 1935.

The second volume of Mme Cazamian's history of the interrelation of ideas and the novel in the last decades of the nineteenth century is not quite so large as the first, which appeared in 1923 and treated of the scientific trends of thought in the late Victorian novel,¹ but it is constructed on the same general principles. With epic breadth she passes the various phases

¹ See *E. S.* VII (1925), 54-55.

and ripples of the general aesthetic movement in review, giving full-length portraits of all the principal and many of the minor figures and discussing with unbiased fullness all the books of importance that the period produced under this head. After a short introduction the first chapter describes *la revanche de l'art*, the reaction against the intense intellectualism of the scientific point of view not only in the arts but in all the fields of thought not purely scientific in character. "L'assouplissement du rationalisme et de l'empirisme dans la domaine de la science, leur discrédit relatif dans celui de la métaphysique, et l'émancipation de l'art," she says, "sont les aspects divers d'un même courant de la vie morale". In this connection Darwin is of less importance than Spencer. The arts openly declared their independence of pure thought, the senses were made the basis of art and given free play, freedom from responsibility made pleasure the fundamental aim in art and the new hedonism sought support in the Renaissance, in Goethe, in the literature and the art of Greece and of modern France. Victorianism had been intensely British and insular; the new movement was cosmopolitan as no other had been before it. As in France, "épater le bourgeois" became in England an occupation of major importance and occasioned a great deal of loose morality and downright perversity in literary and artistic form, but the form itself, the craftsmanship involved, was never raised to so high a level of appreciation and rarely reached a higher level of attainment than in the generation of Whistler and Wilde and Aubrey Beardsley.

Thus the fundamental lines of Mme Cazamian's view of the period are substantially those generally accepted, but she has succeeded in giving them a wider perspective and a deeper root in a broader subsoil of contemporary thought. In the rest of the book her method and her achievement are much the same. Three chapters deal with various types of aestheticism that developed out of the trends of the time and prepared the new literature: the "evolutionary aestheticism" of Vernon Lee and Lafcadio Hearn, the "social aestheticism" of William Morris and the "intuitional aestheticism" of Walter Pater, — the latter, of course, the most important of the three, so far as this book is concerned. The grouping is somewhat far-fetched in some cases; Violet Paget's ideas are fairly consistent and may be convincingly deduced from her Spencerianism, since Spencer's aesthetics, as Mme C. neatly puts it, was not so pessimistic as the rest of his philosophy. But in an essential romantic like Lafcadio Hearn there is only a loose connection between his professed evolutionism and his natural quest for the beautiful life. Morris stands more closely in relation to his time and Mme C. has some fine remarks to make on his primitivism, his Germanic leanings and the nostalgia of his last writings. Likewise an un-English, a Continental strain is remarkable in Pater, possibly due to his Dutch descent and his frequent sojourns in Germany. Since Pater became the prophet of the new generation, this fact is of considerable importance. He was already an Oxford don when Ruskin gave his lectures there before enormous audiences of enthusiastic students,

and much of Pater's philosophy may have been a reaction against the elder man's moralistic Victorianism. The weight he attaches to music, on the other hand, seems to have come directly from Germany and to have been supported by the growing fame and notoriety of Wagner while the strain of voluntarism in Pater's philosophy places him in the vicinity of Schopenhauer, whose works likewise became more widely known in England in the wake of the new cult of Wagner.

As in these early chapters, Mme Cazamian, in the main body of her book, adds acute observations of her own to the generally accepted views on the authors and books she discusses. A full chapter on Oscar Wilde stresses the more serious aspects of his genius, his great reading and wide knowledge of European literature, thus tending to minimize the importance of his incessant borrowing. Since in England "les disciples de Zola furent accusés de décadence ... aussi bien que les émules de Wilde", we find them side by side in the Yellow Book and the publications in the Keynote Series, which Mme C. treats with more than usual emphasis. After 1895, however, naturalism was declining and the aesthetics of decadence, finding a natural support in the fanaticism for art, were expounded by Arthur Symons and put into practice by Aubrey Beardsley, who, as Mme C. aptly puts it, "réalise le désir qu'Oscar Wilde prête à Dorian Gray". The decadent movement itself was not extinguished by the scandal of Wilde's fall, and in so far as it was anti-Victorian it actually came out triumphant, since anti-Victorianism remained a catch-word and a force for the next two generations. To Arthur Machen, though, as she says herself, "le mouvement littéraire contemporain, sans qu'il l'ignorât, ne semble pas avoir eu de prestige particulier pour lui, ni d'action directe sur la plupart de ses oeuvres", Mme C. devotes a whole chapter. Machen's essays, collected under the title of *Hieroglyphics* in 1902, she places in importance beside Pater's *Renaissance* and Wilde's *Intentions*; his story, *The Hill of Dreams*, is the most decadent book in English literature, "le cauchemar d'une jeunesse inquiète et troublée"; while the man himself though he represents strongly "la réaction extrême contre l'utilitarisme socialisant, le conformisme moral et le matérialisme pseudo-scientifique", "a manqué son heure, en ce que l'isolement dans lequel il a vécu l'a d'abord empêché de joindre sa fortune à celle d'écrivains auxquels il était naturellement apparenté". In the work of Richard LeGallienne, Max Beerbohm and others decadent aestheticism found its "sublimation", while through Yeats and William Sharp (Fiona Macleod) aestheticism entered the Irish literary movement as one of its main forces. For, in liberating literature from the controlling tutelage of the intellect, it opened up the realms of the imagination, which became the chief field for the young Irish poets, and permitted the rich development of mysticism and literary symbolism. What Yeats was for Ireland, Sharp was for Scotland, in his dual personality a more robust figure than the Irish poet, a man who knew Nietzsche as early as 1887, when the German philosopher was not even a name in England, and who was the only one of the whole generation who knew America well and brought the

transcendental idealism of Emerson into the movement. It was Emerson who supported him in his deep love of nature — a trait which shows how diametrically opposed the various aspects of the aesthetic movement could be and that only a veritable Proteus could carry them all within one personality. But even George Moore, who was this Proteus and with whom Mme C. closes her book, only passed through the various phases of the movement as stages in the realisation of his own self and in late years burned more than one idol he had worshipped in earlier times, prolonging the reign of aestheticism during the first twenty years of the new century.

Moore is the only novelist in the proper sense of the term among all the authors treated in the book, and his chief work as a novelist does not even belong to the province the book sets itself to explore. His early novels are discussed in Mme Cazamian's first volume, and thus the title of her book remains largely unsupported by its contents. Mme C. herself realised the discrepancy and offers her work as an intermediary study between her first volume and a third and final one which is to treat of the novelists proper — Meredith, Stevenson, Bennett, Wells, etc. — and to be entitled: *Les doctrines d'action et le roman, de 1890 à 1914*. More important than this slight inconsistency, which in no way impairs the value and interest of her book, is the fact that she almost completely ignores a large and important body of criticism and research the use of which could only have been of advantage. It is undoubtedly true that the old-fashioned German literary dissertation fully deserves the neglect that is meted out to it as its due punishment. But times have changed and the last twenty years have seen a new type of dissertation appear which a serious investigator in English literary history can not afford to pass by. Bernhard Fehr has, by his own extensive researches and the detailed investigations of his pupils, placed modern English literature in the forefront of German academic interest. The period covered by this book in particular can no longer be exhaustively treated without consulting the results of the work of the Zurich school. Mme C. shows no sign of even a superficial knowledge of it; she cites a dissertation by E. J. Bock (Bonn, 1913), but omits the name of the author and quotes the title in French translation in a misleading way. The chapter on Wilde's plagiarisms, in which this occurs, makes no mention of Fehr or his extensive work on Wilde, though Choisy is repeatedly quoted. Neither Alice Herzog's study of Wilde's tales (Zurich 1930) nor Baumann's work on Wilde's literary theories (Zurich 1933) is mentioned. The most detailed study of the Yellow Book and the Savoy is Marguerite Strehlers thesis (Zurich 1932), but Mme C. obviously does not know of its existence. No adequate discussion of Arthur Symonds is possible today without reference to Max Wildi's masterly analysis of Symonds's criticism (Angl. Forschungen, Heidelberg 1929), and Mme C.'s chapter on Symonds, which ignores it, is a proof. In the bibliography she lists, under Pater, Staub's book on the *Imaginary Portraits* (Zurich 1926), but there is no sign that she used it and a consultation of Gilomen's

findings about George Moore's early work (Zurich 1933) would certainly have improved the relative passages in her otherwise valuable study of the novelist. We do not look for mature and balanced judgments in doctoral dissertations, though occasionally they are met with; but the "spadework" should, and frequently does, offer the material on which judgments may be founded and no serious worker in the field will ignore it.

Aside from this rather serious shortcoming Mme Cazamian's work has all the good qualities of her French training and can be warmly recommended as a well-written, comprehensive and interesting treatment of one of the most important epochs in English literature.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

Der Aufstieg der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika zur Weltmacht. Staat und Wirtschaft der USA. im 20. Jahrhundert. By MAX SILBERSCHMIDT, Professor in the University of Zurich. xx and 498 pp. 8°. Aarau: Verlag H. R. Sauerländer & Co. 1941.

The fact that the name of the great American republic is correctly given in the title of the book makes one favorably disposed toward its author and the expectation thus raised is not disappointed by a reading of his work. Prof. Silberschmidt has undertaken a difficult task in attempting to trace the growth of the United States to its present position as the dominant power in the world without falling into a partisan spirit in discussing events, personalities and problems that have not by any means reached the stage at which they can easily be treated dispassionately. He places himself squarely on the ground that he is a Swiss citizen who is constitutionally neutral in the affairs of the world and who can speak of American affairs in particular with sympathy but without bias. On the whole, one must concede that he has succeeded; his judgments are fair, when he makes any, which is not over frequently, since he usually contents himself with a plain and accurate relation of the facts. He makes no attempt at brilliance and the book is in no sense "epoch-making". There is no attempt to probe deeper into personalities and problems than has heretofore been done by others. Indeed, that is perhaps one of the more serious criticisms one might make of his work; the author seems to have restricted his preparation to a careful reading of the books already written on the various aspects of the epoch he treats of — mostly American books — and there is little sign that he went down to original documents, even to the reading of the contemporary press. For a book, however, that covers a period so long and so eventful as the fifty years ending in 1940 and which has been so fully discussed from all possible points of view, a mastery of the relative literature is work enough. Indeed, Prof. S. has saturated his

mind with American thought and American political and economic terms to such an extent that his own native German has suffered severely by the process; his German style is really poor and often inadequate to the task.

In other respects, too, one notices that he is not a linguist. The most ticklish problem for him was naturally the entry of the United States into the last war against Germany. He handles the matter with careful tact and succeeds in presenting the main facts of the case without favor or bias. But one element has entirely slipped his mind, namely the enormous force that lies in the community of language. In 1914 German Switzerland was predominantly pro-German, French Switzerland pro-French, though in both cases history and the political interests of the country militated against such an attitude. The same is true of the United States; as late as the middle nineties England appeared as an active adversary to the American republic in the last of a long series of more or less serious "incidents" that kept the animosities of the 18th century alive all through the 19th. And the ever-growing fraction of non-British descent in the population tended to strengthen this anti-British spirit. Yet, when the time came, the country swung into line and the feeble opposition to its entry into the war was easily beaten down. The community of ideas and ideals imbedded in the common language was a far stronger force than any appeal to reason or ethics. That has come to be, from the point of view of power-politics, the deeper meaning of the demand for colonies and it may indicate a limitation in the Swiss mentality, in which neutrality is so paramount, that Prof. S. did not realise the importance of this element in the situation twenty-five years ago.

In detail, there are but few remarks to be made as to his statements. He repeatedly assumes the year 1900 as the date of the "closing of the frontier", presumably because of the belated opening of the Indian Territory to settlement. Actually, the frontier was closed ten years earlier and the Populist unrest was partly a result. The statement at the bottom of page 2 referring to Jefferson, Hamilton and the problem of centralisation of government is misleading in this form. The Spanish War was not fought with, but about, Cuba (p. 13). On page 14 the reference is to the American merchant marine, not to the navy. Page 15: after the Civil War all danger of aggression from a European power, especially England, ceased, and consequently the necessity for maintaining a large navy vanished. No other country except Great Britain had a large navy. But in the nineties Germany and Japan appeared on the scene and everybody began building. Page 16: the great steel industry grew fat on the expansion of the railways; government contracts in large quantities came much later. Page 38: in the figure denoting the cost of the Spanish war a handful of zeros must be missing! And the dollar-mark should always stand *before* the figure! Bryan was the chief hero, but hardly the "Wegbereiter" of Populism (page 49). It is doubtful whether Elihu Root was not a more powerful personality in the Republican Party than Theodore Roosevelt (p. 54). Page 65: J. P. Morgan inherited the banking business

from his father, who began as a dry-goods merchant in Connecticut. The transaction that placed the Morgan bank among the leading financial institutions of the world was the floating of the French loan that was to pay the reparations of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. The early Railway Brotherhoods were unions of engineers and skilled mechanics, not merely of "Arbeiter" (p. 116). Battle-cruisers (Schlachtkreuzer) were not built and named so till the construction of H. M. S. Dreadnought in 1906 revolutionized the navies of the world. The United States hardly had five battle-cruisers as early as 1900 (p. 194). Naval vessels are not measured by "Rauminhalt" but by "Wasserverdrängung", displacement. How the position of the working-man was improved when, with the cost of living at 157 and a nominal wage at 192, his real wage was only 122 is not quite clear (p. 223). The freedom of the seas and American rights connected therewith were only part of Wilson's reasons for entering the war (p. 234). Many years later an ex-ambassador of the United States to a European power stated in a public lecture at Chicago that Wilson told him that he never intended to allow England to be beaten. It is the same policy that the present government at Washington is following and in the light of recent events Prof. S. should have recognized one of the axioms of American statesmanship.

In spite of these and other small blemishes — the list above has taken us only through half the book! — Prof. S. has given us a very useful and welcome book on a subject that is growing daily more important in the affairs of the world.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

Die oa-Schreibung im Englischen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Orthographie. Von HEINZ UMPFENBACH. (Palaestra 201.) 118 pp. Leipzig: Meyer und Müller. 1935. RM. 5.60.

The eccentricities of English spelling have ever been a stumbling-block to the learner and a problem to the student of the English language. The nucleus of the present treatise is a catalogue, from sources ranging between the 12th and the 17th century, of the spelling *oa* for ME *ō*, generally spelt *o*. In Early Mod. Engl. *ō* became *ō̄*, in Late Mod. Engl. *ou*, before *r* &c. Thus we have side by side *home* and *foam*, *sore* and *soar*. The spelling *oa* is purely graphic, the letter *a* has no sound equivalent. We are shown convincingly that it developed under the influence of the spelling *ea* for ME *ē*, which first appeared in the 12th century, and is a revival of OE *ea*, to which many of these words go back. In the 13th century *ea* disappeared; it was revived in the 15th century under Norman influence and has not been dropped since. The development of *oa* is parallel; as with *ea*, there

length. Thus it is prevalent before final consonant (*cloak, boat, soap*) and regular before [tʃ] and [ks] (*coach, coax*), where o might be taken for a short sound. But it rarely occurs before r, as r itself points to the length of the preceding vowel (*story*). For the same reason o prevails when there is a final -e (*spoke*). Occasionally the two spellings may have served to distinguish homophones (*road-rode*). In learned words oa does not occur.

The value of this comprehensive and well-founded monograph is impaired by one serious drawback. In the list of words with the pronunciation ɔ:, spelt o + r, those also are included that go back to ME ȝ, like *for, nor, horn, cork* (p. 28). This increases the number of words with o unduly and conveys a wrong impression of the proportion of o to oa spellings. ME ȝ was only lengthened to ȝ̄ in the 17th century and is therefore outside the range of this investigation. The same applies to words like *door, floor* (p. 32) which go back to ME ȝ̄. Even among the words without r pronounced ɔ:, whose source, we are told, is ME ȝ̄, there are quite a number that go back to ME ȝ, e.g., p. 9: *broth, froth, moth*; p. 10: *loss, moss, toss*; p. 11: *cost, frost, lost*. This blunder distorts the results of the investigation.

Basel.

MARIA SCHUBIGER.

Brief Mention

De Complete Werken van William Shakespeare. In de vertaling van Dr. L. A. J. BURGERSDIJK. Bewerkt en van een inleiding voorzien door Prof. Dr. F. DE BACKER en Dr. G. A. DUDOK. Vignetten en typographische verzorging van A. Hahn Jr. Vijfde druk. Eerste deel. 679 pp. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff. 1941. Compleet in drie gebonden deelen; per deel f 7.50.

This new edition of the only complete Dutch version of Shakespeare shows that after more than half a century Burgersdijk's translation, in spite of its now somewhat old-fashioned poetic diction, continues to hold its own. The fifth edition is more than a mere reprint. Though Burgersdijk's text has not been tampered with, his notes have been supplemented and brought up to date, and his Introduction has been replaced by an entirely new one. A series of chapters on England in the time of Shakespeare (mainly about his predecessors and contemporaries), the theatre in Shakespeare's time, Shakespeare's life and works, Shakespeare and the arts, and the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, tell the general reader as much as he will probably want to know about these subjects. There is no great harm in the fact that some of the views enunciated are a little behind the times, or that here and there a name or a date are incorrectly given (e.g., Vulippo instead of Viluppo, three times on pp. 18 & 19; Antonio and Cleopatra; Theobald's edition dated 1752 instead of 1733, etc.). On the whole the Introduction meets all reasonable demands, whereas the get-up of the first volume leaves nothing to be desired. In its renovated garb Burgersdijk's *Shakespeare* ought to win many new readers and to meet with the approval of many old ones. — Z.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft von WOLFGANG KELLER. Band 76 (Neue Folge XVII. Band). 266 pp. Weimar: Böhlau. 1940.

The Shakespeare-Jahrbuch deserves more attention than can be given to it in the space here at our disposal; editor and publisher will, we hope, accept this brief mention in earnest of more extensive notices in the near future. The latest volume contains papers by H. Schöffler on Shakespeare und der junge Goethe; by the editor on Die Franzosen in Shakespeare's Dramen; by E. Castle on Shakespeare und seine Truppe; H. Opper on Shakespeare und Kierkegaard; W. Schoof on Dingelstedts Plan einer neuen Shakespeare-Übersetzung; M. Deutschbein on Die politischen Sonette Shakespeares; I. Thurmman on Shakespeare im Film. Perhaps the most valuable part are the book reviews and the survey of periodicals. Our foremost Shakespeare specialist, the late Dr. B. A. P. van Dam, whose name is not even mentioned in the Introduction to the new Burgersdijk, is commemorated by Prof. Keller in his presidential address. Articles on Shakespeare in this journal are duly noticed. The volume concludes with the usual data on Shakespeare performances in Germany. In 1939 twenty-four of the plays were produced, three of them (*Shrew*, *Hamlet*, and *Much Ado*) more than 100, two (*MND* and *TwN*) more than 200 times. — Z.

Garden Walks with Candidates. Being practical lessons in the interpretation of English poetry. By Dr. WILLEM VAN DOORN. 108 pp. Groningen-Batavia: P. Noordhoff N.V. 1941. f 1.60, cloth, f 1.90.

Older readers of *E. S.* will remember a series of articles on contemporary English poets — Yeats, Gibson, de la Mare, Masfield, Stephens — published in this journal in the early and middle twenties by Willem van Doorn. They were written with a remarkable command of English, with a certain swagger, too, it is true, and showed their author to be a man of uncommonly wide reading in modern as well as older poetry, and of a highly, if somewhat too consciously developed critical faculty. If the series had been continued, revised and collected, we might now have been the richer by a volume of stimulating and informative essays on a subject on which little else worth the reading has been published in Holland. Alas — the booklet that is sent us "for review" to-day has to support the claim that "these 'Garden Walks', if made the most of by aspirants for the 'M.O.A.' certificate, will not only enable them to interpret in a satisfactory way any poem they may be set at the examination, but will also help considerably to fit them for their future work in class, as teachers, by compelling them to look at more or less known things afresh and with unbiased minds." We do not propose to contest this claim — the reviewing of primers and textbooks has not, as a rule, come within the scope of this journal. We will merely note it as yet another symptom of the fatal lure of the educational for what talent we possess in the ranks of those who have taken up the study of English. Apart from doctoral dissertations and an occasional magazine article, practically all that is published in this country is written either frankly for scholastic and training purposes, or at least with an eye to some examination or other; and even if a book is not primarily written from such motives, it is usually judged from this point of view. It is important that there should be good primers and textbooks, and their authors deserve praise and thanks. It is equally important, however, that some at least of the younger generation should be taught that there are other things to do, and one may be permitted to express regret at seeing a veteran who has shown himself capable of other things — and who advertises himself as "Private Lecturer on Poetry in the University of Amsterdam" — indulging himself in "Garden Walks with Candidates." — Z.